LIBRARY
OF THE
Theological Seminary.
PRINCETON, N. J.

Case ..... Divi. DR439
Shelf ..... Section M17
Book ..... No. v.2

THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

IN ITS RELATIONS WITH

CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

BY

RICHARD ROBERT MADDEN,

Fel. R.C.S. Eng., M.R.I.A., &c.

Author of "Travels in Turkey, Egypt, Syria, and Palestine," "Egypt and Mahommed Ali," "The Mussulman," "Life and Martyrdom of Savonarola," "Infirmities of Genius," "Memoirs of the Countess of Blessington," &c.

VOL. II.

London:

T. CAUTLEY NEWBY,

PUBLISHER, 30, WELBECK STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

1862.

CONTENTS OF CHAPTERS OF VOL. II.

CHAPTER.		PAGE
I.	Syria—Its Divisions, Sects, and Races	1
II.	Syria under Mohammed Ali	43
III.	The Greek Rayah Community of the so-called "Orthodox Church.—Constitution of the Greek Church in Russia and Turkey.—The proposed Re-Union of the Greek and Latin Churches	51
IV.	Proposed Re-Union of the Greek and Latin Churches	87
V.	The Armenian Community	117
VI.	The Maronites	153
VII.	The Order of the Assassins of Persia and Syria of the 11th and 12th centuries, and the derivation from them of the existing secret sects of Syria	162
VIII.	The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Ansayrii	195
IX.	The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Druses	209
X.	The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Metoualis	237
XI.	The influence of Russia over the Great Mass of the Christian Population of the Turkish Empire—The Exercise and Results of that Influence at Different Periods of the Greek Revolution	248
XII.	The Syrian Massacres of Christians by the Druses and Turkish Authorities, in 1860	266
XIII.	Observations on Latest Official Correspondence Relating to Massacres in Syria—Withdrawal of French Troops; and Labors of International Commission	370
XIV.	Death of Sultan Abdul Medjid and Accession of his Brother Abdul Azis—Latest Statement of Financial Statistics of Turkey	387
XV.	The Beginning of The End of The Turkish Empire—Failure of its Institutions to Fulfil the Legitimate Purposes of Governmental Regime—The Well-being and Protection of the People subjected to it—The Decay of Turkey and Impossibility of its Maintenance and Restoration	409

(*For Contents of Appendix see over.*)

APPENDIX.—VOL. II.

NO.		PAGE
I.	Sir Moses Montefiore, Bart., the Originator of The Relief Committee in aid of The Christian Sufferers of Syria, in the late Disturbances	437
II.	Numbers of Believers in Mohammedanism and Buddhism, and and Latest Estimate of Population of the Globe . .	441
III.	List of Ottoman Sovereigns	442
IV.	Dates of Different Crusades	443
V.	The Suez Canal Project	444

THE TURKISH EMPIRE,

IN ITS RELATIONS WITH CHRISTIANITY AND CIVILIZATION.

CHAPTER I.

Syria—Its Divisions, Sects, and Races.

THERE are few regions in the globe that have undergone more revolutions, have had more names assigned to them, and provinces more frequently confounded, than those of Syria. In its numerous revolutions the different races have become so intermixed, that their original characters have been nearly lost altogether.

Volney counts ten invasions of Syria in the course of 2,500 years that have introduced different foreign nations of a distinct origin.

1. The Assyrians of Nineveh, passing the Euphrates, about 750 years before the Christian Æra, sent Colonies into Syria, and in the course of sixty years, were masters of nearly the whole region north of Judea.

2. The Chaldeans of Babylon followed the Assyrians, obtained all the possessions of the latter in Syria, and completed the conquest of that country, with the exception of Tyre.

3. Next came the Persians into Syria, under Cyrus, as conquerors and masters.

4. The Macedonian rule, under Alexander, succeeded the Persian dominion in Syria.

5. Then yielding to the arms of Pompey, Syria became a province of the Roman Empire.

6. Four centuries later, when the sons of Theodosius divided their vast patrimony, Syria was annexed to the Empire of Constantinople.

7. In 622 A.D., the hordes of Arabia, under the banners of Mohammed, ravaged various parts of Syria, and retained possession of some strongholds.

8. The Saracens of the Fatimite and Ommiade dynasties alternately established their power in Syria, and the unhappy country became the theatre of their wars for upwards of three centuries.

9. Turcoman hordes supervened on the ruins of the Saracen power, and obtained possession of several of the chief cities and towns of Syria.

10. Next came the Crusaders, who obtained possession of four or five towns and cities of importance, and, in their turn, were dispossessed by the Mamelukes of Egypt, and Saracens of Damascus; then suddenly the hordes of Tartary, under Timour, swept over Syria, ravaged and desolated the unhappy country, and disappeared as swiftly as they came, and were replaced by the Ottoman Turks, who have now been the ruthless masters and barbarous rulers of Syria, in all its extent, for upwards of four hundred years.

The Romans gave the name Palœstina to the territory included in Judea in its largest extent, to the exclusion however of Phœnicia. They divided Palestine into four regions,—Galilea, Samaria, Judea, and Perea. Palestine corresponds to the land of Canaan, and its name is probably a corruption from that of the Philistines, which occupied a region westward of this land of Canaan.

The name of Syria has been given to this region of Asia Minor, extending north and south (along the Mediterranean), from the Gulf of Alexandretta southward to Gaza, an extreme

length of about three hundred miles; and east and west, from the shores of the Mediterranean, westward, from Beirout to Palmyra, its greatest breadth of settled and permanently occupied territory, of about one hundred and fifty miles.

This name of Syria, transmitted to us from the Greeks, is an abridgment of that of Assyria, first adopted by the Ionians, who frequented their coasts, after Syria had become a province of Assyria.

Abraham Ortelius, in his "Synonymia Geographica" (4to. Aut. 1578), article Syria, tells us that this country was called by the Hebrews, Aram, as St. Jerome testifies. Homer called the people of this country Arimos; and Strabo speaks of them in his day as being still designated Arimos. Josephus calls them Syros Aramœos. Diodorus Siculus speaks of Syria Superior and Inferior. Pliny divides Palestine into several regions:—Palestina, Judea, Cœle, Phœnice, Damascena, Babylonia, Mesopotamia, Sophene (or Sophanina), Comagene, Adiabene, and Antiochia.*

Fuller, in his "Historie of the Holy War" (Book i. ch. 18), says that Palestine, in David's time, maintained a population of 1,300,000 men, besides women, children, and impotent persons; exclusive also of the tribes of Benjamin and Levi, as we are informed in Holy Writ. "Palestine (says Fuller) is bounded on the north by Mount Libanus; west by the Mediterranean Sea; south, by the wilderness of Paran, parting it from Egypt; and the East, by the mountains of Gilead, and the river of Arnon. The soil of this region was transcendantly fruitful. Palestine contained four provinces, Gallilee, Trachonitis (beyond the Jordan), Judea, and Samaria."

In the article on Palestine, Ortelius, in his "Synonymia Geographica," says, "Ptolomy, in his geography, refers to this region, which in the Scriptures is called Elisthem—Canaan—and the Promised Land." St. Jerome (in Locis Hebræicis) says, "It is to be borne in mind, in historical accounts of this

* See Ortelius's "Synonymia Geographica," p. 308.

country, that Judea belongs to Palestine, but Galilea and Samaria belong to Phœnicia." "But now (continues Ortelius) by all Europeans, this country is called the Holy Land, in various terms belonging to different languages, but having the same significations. The Arabs designate Syria by the name Barr-el-Sham, which signifies, "The country to the left."

The promise made (A.M. 2023) to the father of the Jewish people, who came out of Ur, of the Chaldeas, and dwelt in Haran—"And the Lord said to Abram: Go forth, out of thy country, and from thy kindred, and out of thy father's house, and come into the land which I will show to thee," was followed by the departure of Abram, his household and his people; his passage through the Vale of Sichem, and his coming into the Land of Canaan. And there "The Lord appeared unto Abram, and said to him: To thy seed will I give this land." And passing on from thence to a mountain that was on the east side of Bethel, he there pitched his tent, Bethel on the west, and Hai on the east; he built there an altar to the Lord, and called upon his name. And then, we are informed, he went forward, and proceeded to the south, and again returned to Bethel.

Abram dwelt henceforward in the land of Canaan, but Lot and his herdsmen, "Chose to himself the country about the Jordan, and he departed from the east."*

Four hundred and seventy-five years passed over, "And the Lord spoke to Moses the same day (on which speaking to all Israel, he said to the wanderers of forty years in the desert, he commanded them to fulfil the law, 'that they might continue a long time in the land whither they were going over the Jordan to possess it.') Saying: Go up into this mountain, Abarim (that is to say, of the Passages), unto Mount Nebo, which is in the land of Moab, over against Jericho, and see the land of Canaan, which I will deliver unto the children of Israel to possess, and die thou in the mountain. . . . Thou shalt see

* Genesis ch. xiii.

the land before thee, which I will give to the children of Israel, but thou shalt not enter into it."*

"Then Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto Mount Nebo, to the top of Phasgah, over against Jericho, and the Lord showed him all the land of Galaad, as far as Dan."†

In the Book of Joshua, chap. i. v. 2, 3, 4, we read that after the death of Moses, the Lord spoke unto Joshua, and said:—

"Moses, my servant, is dead; arise, and pass over this Jordan, thou, and thy people with thee, unto the land which I will give unto the children of Israel.

"I will deliver unto you every place that the sole of your foot shall tread upon, as I have said to Moses.

"From the desert and from Libanus, unto the great river Euphrates, all the land of the Hittites, unto the great sea towards the going down of the sun, shall be your border."

These limits would include Phœnicia and its principal towns. "Beirout was included in the land of promise (observes Dr. Thompson, in "The Land and the Book," Lond. Ed. 8vo. 1860. p. 19.), but hardly in the land of possession, being one of the seaports of Phœnicia, a country that continued, after the settlement of the Israelites, to be inhabited by the remarkable people who gave it its name. The great size and importance of Beirout are quite modern, indeed within the last thirty years."

It is not mentioned in Scripture under its present name.

Beirout, the ancient Berytus, the place supposed to have its name from the idol, Baal Berith, subsequently named Julia Felix, by Augustus, on account of the fertility and beauty of the adjoining country, still later was the chief place of residence of the Emir Faccardine. The Emir Faccardine, says Maundrell, was, in the reign of Sultan Marat (Sultan Amurath), the fourth Emir, or Prince of the Druses.

Tyre, the principal city of Phœnicia, was founded by a colony from the neighbouring city of Sidon—as Larcher sup-

* Deuteronomy ch. xxxii. vv. 48, 49, 52.

† Ibid, ch. xxxiv. v. 1.

poses, for the event was not certainly known—1690 years before the Christian era (Chron. d'Herodote, cap. p. 131).

The prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, who flourished for 600 to 700 years before our era, represent Tyre at those periods as our Macaulays, McCullocks, and Allisons, now expatiate on the unequalled greatness, and commerce, and wealth of London, as a city of unrivalled trade and opulence, whose "merchants were princes, and her traffickers the honourable of the earth." And lo! all that remains of the greatness, and the commerce, and the riches, and the merchant princes, and the honourable of the earth, who were the traffickers of Phœnicia, is a miserable hamlet, with a few squalid rayahs and wretched Arabs for its inhabitants.

I have visited many wrecks and ruins of ancient capitals, pitiful remains of former renowned cities that were in their time of prosperity great emporiums of trade; vast cities, in fact, that at one period absorbed the commerce of the then known world, and there were gloom and desolation, squalor and penury there in abundance; but nowhere have I felt the overwhelming influence of depression, of this kind of decay and death of all power, activity, movement, and prosperity, so much as at Sour, the squalid representative of her ancient Tyre with all her ships, colonies, and commerce; better far encamp amidst the ruins of Tamor or Thebes, where no human being is to be seen, where there is no interruption to the solemn silence of the place, and where the stillness of death has something of a sacred composure in it, than to be reminded of the awful change that has come over the place and its people by such remnants of humanity as the miserable hovels of Sour send forth to startle the traveller who wanders over the site of ancient Tyre.

"In ancient times Sidon underwent no small share of the vicissitudes incidental to Syrian cities of importance.

"In 1629 the last act of barbarity towards unoffending Sidon (we are told by Chasseaud in his History of the Druses), was perpetrated by the Egyptian Mamelukes under the order of the then Sultan of Egypt, who to the end that it might no more afford

a shelter to or a favourite resort of Christians, caused Sidon to be destroyed; and the pretty gardens and dwelling houses were laid waste by the hands of the ruthless Egyptian soldiers or razed to the ground with fire. Few cities lay claim to greater antiquity than Sidon; it is supposed to have been founded by Sidon, the eldest son of Canaan, and if this be the case, it is now nigh four thousand years old. A Phœnician colony afterwards existed at Sidon.

From this date Sidon fell successively under Saracen, Seljukian, Turkish and Egyptian Sultans, till at the date above recorded, five hundred and sixty-five years ago, the last act of spoliation was committed; and in 1841 Sidon, in common with Syria and Palestine, again fell under the sway of the Ottoman empire, after having been ruled by Ibraham Pasha for a few brief years.

"Sidon is now computed to contain upwards of twelve thousand inhabitants, two-thirds of which are Mohammedans, the rest Christians and Jews; the Christians being by far the most numerous of the two. They still continue to be a very industrious people, excelling in the manufacture of silk scarfs and gaily ornamented *boshias*, a species of wide handkerchiefs bound round the caps of the men, partly to protect their heads from the sun, and partly for ornament's sake.

"Beirout and Sidon may be said to be the sea-port towns of the country of the Druses."

Arnold in his "Lectures on History," justly observes, that the physical geography of a country exercises a vast influence over the destiny of its inhabitants.

There is no country in the world more peculiar in respect to its physical geography than Syria, and especially that southern part of it which includes Palestine. The observation of Arnold applies to the whole region of Syria from north to south, from its northern frontier, the line from the Gulf of Alexandretta, eastward to the Euphrates, and along the Mediterranean, Beirout, Sidon, and Tyre, and the Lebanon range eastward of them, then

from Mount Carmel to Ascalon, within which parallels Palestine is included.

In a popular modern work by a reverend professor of Oxford, that treats of Syria—"Sinai and Palestine in connexion with their history." By the Rev. A. N. Stanley A.B. Canon of Canterbury (8vo. London, 1856), we find the singular features of the physical geography of Syria pointed out and their conformity strikingly exhibited, with the character of the people principally concerned in its history, and the destiny of those separated from surrounding nations and preserved from them till the time appointed for their deliverance.

"In Palestine (says Mr. Stanley), as in Greece, every traveller is struck with the smallness of the territory. He is surprised, even after all that he has heard, at passing, in one long day from the capital of Judea to that of Samaria or of seeing within eight hours three such spots as the Hebron, Bethlehem, and Jerusalem. The breadth of the country from the Jordan to the sea is rarely more than fifty miles. Its length from Dan to Beersheba is about a hundred and eighty miles. So that the main breadth of Palestine from east to west is estimated at 50 miles, and its length from north to south 180 miles.

"The time is now gone by when the grandeur of a country is measured by its size, or the diminutive extent of an illustrious people otherwise than enhance the magnitude of what they have done."

The contrast between the littleness of Palestine and the vast extent of the Empires which hung upon its northern and southern extremities is rarely absent from the mind of the Prophets and Psalmists. It helps them to exalt their sense of the favour of God, towards their land by magnifying their little hills, and dry torrent-beds into an equality with the giant hills of Lebanon, and Herman, and the sea like rivers of Mesopotamia. It also fosters the consciousness that they were not always to be restrained within these earthly barriers. "This place is too straight for me: give me place where I may

dwell." Nor is it only the smallness but the narrowness of the territory which is remarkable. From almost every high point of the country its whole breadth is visible, from the long wall of the Moab Hills on the east to the Mediterranean on the west.*

Here we find the physical geography of a country fitted as it were for a nation secluded and set apart by Providence from the rest of the world.

Between the people of Israel in the Holy Land and the great empires of Assyria and Babylon, which rose on the plains of Mesopotamia, the cities of the Euphrates, and the Tigris, the rulers and corruptors in their days of pride and prosperity of all the kingdoms then known in the world: the Eastern wilderness intervened. The wandering tribes of the desert, the Nomade, Turcomans, and Bedouins, hung on the eastern frontier of the Holy Land. And on the southern frontier, they and the desert of Arabia interposed between Palestine and Egypt. The western boundary of the Holy Land was the Mediterranean.

Palestine was like an oasis in the wilderness, in the midst of plunderers indeed, but secured by her mountain barriers from the predatory hordes of the desert.

The whole geological structure of Palestine is limestone, with a few exceptions in the valley of the Jordan. The rocky character of the whole country has its bearings on historical events.

"As a general rule," says Professor Stanley, "Palestine is not only a mountainous country, but a mass of mountains rising from a level on the sea-coast on the west, and from a level desert on the east, only cut asunder by the valley of the Jordan from north to south, and at the valley of Jezreel from east to west. The result of this peculiarity is, that not merely the hill tops but the valleys and the plains of the interior of Palestine, both east and west, are themselves so high above the level of the sea as to partake of all the main characteristics of mountainous districts and scenery."†

* "Sinai and Palestine," by the Rev. A. B. Stanley, p. 114.

† Professor Stanley, "Sinai and Palestine," p. 126.

Jerusalem is 2,200 feet above the level of the sea.

Bethlehem	2,500	„	„
Mount of Olives	2,396	„	„
Hebron	2,800	„	„

Lebanon is the birthplace of the four rivers of Judea and Phœnicia, of Antioch and Damascus; of these, the Orontes, the river of the Greek kingdom of Antioch and Seleucia is of most celebrity in history.

The Litany, or the "Syrian River," is the Leontes of modern geography, a name perhaps erroneously given to it. The Barada is the ancient Abana or Pharpar of the Old Testament.

This region of the Lebanon was the border land of sacred and common history, "the scene of the oldest traditions and civilizations of the world." According to Professor Stanley, "the meeting point of all the religions of western Asia."

The ancient city of Ephron the Hittite, the first home of Abraham and the Patriarchs in Syria, Hebron was the nearest seat of civilized life, not only of Judah but of Palestine.

Of the Jordan with its manifold peculiarities, that river which throughout the length of Palestine, "the artery of the whole country is unique on the surface of the globe," Mr. Stanley observes:—"The ranges are remarkable of the Lebanon, the courses of the Orantes, the Leontes, and the Barada (the Pharpar of the Old Testament, the river of the Syrian kingdom of Damascus) are curious, but the deep depression of the Jordan has absolutely no parallel.

"No other valley in the world presents such extraordinary physical features, none has been the subject of such various theories as to its origin and character. How far this strange conformation of the Holy Land has had any extensive influence on its history may be doubtful. But it is perhaps worth observing at the outset, that we are in a country, of which the geography and the history, each claims to be singular of its kind:—the history, by its own records, unconscious, if one may so say, of the physical peculiarity, the geography, of the discoveries of modern science, wholly without

regard, perhaps even indifferent or hostile, to the claims of the history. Such a coincidence may be accidental; but at least it serves to awaken the curiosity, and strike the imagination; at least, it lends dignity to the country, where the earth and the man are thus alike objects of wonder and investigation.

It is around and along this deep fissure that the hills of western and eastern Palestine spring up, forming the link between the high group of Lebanon on the north, and the high group of Sinai on the south: forming the mountain-bridge, or isthmus, between the ocean of the Assyrian desert, and the ocean (as it seemed to the ancient world) of the Mediterranean, or "Great Sea," of the west.*

An anonymous writer, whom I know to be a Protestant clergyman, in a publication of no slight merit, entitled "Some Strictures upon that Portion of 'Sinai and Palestine,' by the Rev. A. P. Stanley ("By a Recent Traveller There" Lon. 1857,) makes the following very just and valuable observations, applicable indeed to statements put forth by nine-tenths of our modern travellers in Syria.

"The Oxford Professor (the Rev. A. P. Stanley) appears ever anxious to impress upon his readers his opinion of the superiority of Western Christianity—that portion of it which, we presume, he would term Protestant—over that form of doctrine and practise which obtains in the east. This is not only remarkable in the work under notice, but likewise peeps out of the author's introductory professional lecture delivered in the University. Perhaps Utah and the Mormon colony, that most consistent of all sects, claiming and exercising the right of private judgment, and most protesting of all Protestants, was not present to his mind when Professor Stanley wrote of our holy religion the words—'Which has attained its full dimensions only in proportion as it has travelled farther from its original source'—or—'as rising in the east, yet finding its

* "Sinai and Palestine," by Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, M.A. p. 111. London, 1856.

highest degree of development and fulfilment in the west" (pp. 155, 456). The question involved in these quotations is too large for discussion in this place. To these, however, together with the assertion that 'Christianity has no home on earth, least of all in its own birthplace,' we can only state our non-adhesion, believing them, as we do, to arise from an un-Catholic and Sectarian spirit, and from a narrow and bigoted system, which, unable to sympathise with anything in a Sister Church that accords not to its peculiar Shibboleth; a system and a spirit which predeterminately objects to everything in doctrine and discipline not fashioned to its own meagre form; and which ends in a depreciation of Christ's holy Church in the east, and in an Anti-Christian admiration of the followers of the false prophet of Mecca."

For these words of a high principled Christian philosophy, full of wisdom and charity, and evidential of a tolerant spirit, enlightened, enlarged, and improved by travel, every intelligent Christian reader, whatever may be his creed, will feel grateful.

The different races of Syria, or rather, the mixture of different nations settled in that country, may be divided into three classes:—

1. The descendants of the people conquered by the Arabs—namely, the Greeks of the Lower Empire.

2. The descendants of the Saracen conquerors.

3. The descendants of the Turcoman tribes, settled in Syria, during the period of the Seljukian domination, and the present rulers, the Ottoman Turks.

With respect to the Greeks and Arabs, Volney sub-divides them thus:—

"Firstly—The Greeks who are called Orthodox, and who are separated from the Roman Catholic Church.

Secondly—Latin Greeks, re-united to that communion.

Thirdly—Maronites, or Greeks of the sect of the Monk Maron, formerly independent of the two communions, but at present united to the latter.

"The Arabs must be divided into:

"Firstly—The proper descendants of the conquerors, who have greatly intermixed their blood, and are considerably the most numerous.

"Secondly—The Metoualis, distinguished from these by their religious opinions.

"Thirdly—The Druses, distinct likewise from the same reason.

"Fourthly—The Ansarians, who are also descended from the Arabs.

"To these people, who are the cultivators and settled inhabitants of Syria, must still be added three other wandering or pastoral tribes, viz., the Turkomen, the Kurds, and the Bedouin Arabs.

"Such are the different races dispersed over the country, between the sea and the desert, from Gaza to Alexandretta.

"In this enumeration it is remarkable that the ancient inhabitants have no remaining representative; their distinguishing character is lost and confounded in that of the Greeks, who in fact, by a continued residence from the days of Alexander, have had sufficient time entirely to take place of the ancient people; the country alone, and a few traits of manners and customs, preserve the vestiges of distant ages."*

"The general language of Syria is the Arabic tongue. M. Niebuhr reports, upon hearsay, that the Syriac is still used in some villages of the mountains; but though I interrogated, on this subject, several monks, who are perfectly well acquainted with the country, I have not been able to learn anything like it. I have been told only, that in the towns of Maloula and Sidnaia, near Damascus, they speak a dialect so corrupted, that it is difficult to be understood. But this difficulty proves nothing, since in Syria, as in all Arabian countries, the dialects vary at every place. The Syriac may be, therefore, regarded as a dead language; for the Maronites, who have preserved it in their liturgy, and in their mass, understand very little of it, while

* Volney, "Travels in Syria and Egypt." Ed. 8vo. 1788. vol. i. p. 222.

they recite them. We may assert the same of the Greek. Among the monks and schismatic priests, there are very few who have any knowledge of it, unless they have made it their particular study, in the islands of the Archipelago; besides, we know that the modern Greek is so corrupted, that it would no more enable a man to understand Demosthenes, than the Italian to read Cicero. The Turkish language is only used in Syria by the military, persons in office, and the Turkoman hordes. Some of the natives learn it, as the Turks learn Arabic, to facilitate their dealings with strangers; but the pronunciation and accent of these two languages, have so little analogy, that they always continue foreign to each other."*

The descendants of the various races of the inhabitants of Syria with few exceptions, are dispersed over the country. The Greeks, especially those of the orthodox community. The Turks and Arabs are scattered over all the provinces. The Turks, however, reside only in towns where they hold some military or civil employment, or are engaged in commerce. The Arabs as well as the Greeks inhabit the villages, and are the peasants of the country in all agricultural localities, and are the industrious labouring poor of the larger towns.

The Greeks of the Roman Catholic Church, far less numerous than the so called orthodox Greeks are chiefly settled in towns where they carry on various small trading and handicraft occupations.

The Maronites are one of the exceptions I have above referred to, they are concentrated in particular localities, and have a national sort of existence. Formerly they occupied exclusively the country between the summit of the Lebanon to the Mediterranean, from the Nahr-el-Kelb, to the Nahr-bar. This was their chief locality in the time of Volney, but changes have taken place in these settlements which will be noticed in the more ample details, that will be given of the different classes. The Druses at the time above referred to, from 1783 to 1785

* Volney's Travels in Syria and Egypt, p. 226.

occupied the country bordering on that of the Maronites, and extended from Nahr-el-Kelb, to the vicinity of Tyre.

Of this sect details will be found in a separate chapter.

The *Metoualis* are followers of Aly, son-in-law of Mohammed. They reject his three predecessors in the Khalafite, and affirm that he alone is the lawful Imâm, and that supreme authority, in things temporal and spiritual, belongs to him and his descendants. They reject the *Sonna*, or traditional law, and are, therefore, regarded as heretics by other Moslems. They number about 25,000. Nearly one-half of them occupy Beled Besharah, on the southern border of the Druse country; and there, seventy-five years ago, in one of the periodical Druse persecutions of Christians, one or two of their Sheikhs afforded an asylum to the fleeing Christians, though others took part in the Druse massacres. A more powerful section of them resided in villages of Anti-Lebanon, near Baalbek, and were ruled by the noble family of Harfûsh. The Harfûsh Emirs have for ages been the pest of the country. Hitherto they had been the deadly enemies of both the Druses and the government; but recently they joined both Turks and Druses in the plunder and burning of the Christian town of Zahleh!

The Metouali's formerly occupied the valley of Bekaa, near the sea coast of Tyre, but they have undergone great changes and misfortunes that have reduced their numbers considerably, and the limits of the locality they occupied within the last century.

The Ansayrii occupy the mountainous district from Tripoli to Attakia, and from Nahr-akkar to the latter town under different denominations, or rather known by various nicknames, and particular designations given to their different secret sects; such as the Kelbia, Kadmousia, the Ihamsia, &c.

The Turcomans, Kurds, and Bedouin Arabs, have no fixed places of abode, or pasture for their herds and flocks; they follow in Syria and on its confines the same nomade lives which their cognate tribes do in other regions.

The Turcomans, however, are mostly met with in the vicinity

of Antioch, the Kurds in the wilds adjacent to Alexandretta, the Bedouins wander over the whole frontiers of Syria.

Dr. Thompson, a missionary in Syria and Palestine for the past twenty-five years, in a recent work, entitled "The Land and the Book," illustrative of the Holy Land, published in 1860, gives the following estimate of the numbers of the different Syrian races and sects:—

"Syria has always been cursed with a multiplicity of tribes and religions, which split up the country into small principalities and conflicting classes, the fruitful parent of civil war, anarchy, and all confusion. Nor has this source of mischief been materially mitigated down to the present hour. This will appear but too evident from the following statistics:—

The Moslems, who are the ruling class all over the country, except in Lebanon, may number about	800,000
They are divided into two principal sects—the Sunites and Shiïtes. There may be 50,000 Kurds	50,000
The Nusairîyeh occupy the mountains north of Tripoli, and may amount to	150,000
The Ismailîyeh and Yezzîdy are too few to merit specific attention; and the same may be said of the Nowar, or gipsies, who are found in all parts. They will not amount to more than .	20,000
The Druses occupy the southern half of Lebanon, extend over to Hermon, and out into the Hauran—a few thousands reside in Jebel el 'Alah, west of Aleppo, and on Carmel, and the mountains above Acre. They number about . .	100,000
The Jews are about 25,000. In Jerusalem, 7,000; in Damascus, 5,000; Aleppo, 4,000; Safed, 2,000; Tiberias, 1,500; Hebron, 600; and the remainder in Beirût, Sidon, &c., &c. . .	25,000
The Maronites, chiefly of Lebanon, may be . .	200,000
The orthodox Greeks, in all parts of the country .	150,000

Armenians, 20,000; Jacobites, 15,000 . . . 35,000
There are Papal offshoots from these sects, which may number 70,000 or 80,000 . . . 80,000

"There are a few Latins in most of the large cities, and also Protestants in various parts.

"This gives a total of 1,610,000; which, of course, is only as close an approximation as the very imperfect statistics of the government, and of the different sects enable us to make."

Ubicini and Viquesnel estimate the population of Syria at two millions and a half, thus distributed:—

Mussulmans	1,200,000
Maronites, and Roman Catholics of all sects	350,000
Orthodox Greeks	400,000
Jews	150,000
Druses	300,000
Metoualis, Yezides, Ansareeyz, and other sects	100,000
Total	2,500,000

In the second volume of M. Ubicini's work, published in 1854, he makes some important alterations in his previous estimate of the Latin Roman Catholic Rayah populations of the Turkish Empire. But it must be admitted by the most ardent admirers of M. Ubicini's "Lettres sur la Turquie," that once he entered on subjects which the archives of the different departments of the Turkish government could not enlighten him upon, his value as a Turkish historian was at an end, and most certain it is that on the subject of the Roman Catholic populations throughout the Turkish Empire, he was very scantily, or rather, very ill informed. For instance, in the first volume of his Letters, he states that the numbers in the Latin church, under the Patriarch in Jerusalem, throughout the Turkish Empire amounted to 640,000. But in the second volume he states that he inadvertently had comprised in this item 100,000

Franks, members of the Roman Catholic church, citizens of foreign Christian states, resident in the Turkish dominions, and scattered throughout the Turkish Empire. And previously, in the same volume, he had to state that he had made a mistake, and in the account he had given of the Roman Catholic Rayahs had omitted to include 35,000 United Armenians of the Roman Catholic community.

The Christian population of the several communities of all sects believing in Christ, and that of the Jewish people subject to Turkish rule—the Rayahs of the Ottoman Empire, according to the latest estimates, amount to about ten millions. They constitute nearly a third part of the population of the Turkish Empire.

They are divided into five communities, governed by their respective patriarchs, and the Israelites by the grand Rabbi of the Jews.

In the first volume of M. Ubicini's "Lettres sur la Turquie," published in 1854, the estimate of the total Latin Roman Catholic population, in the Turkish Empire, is set down at 940,000.

But, rectifying the errors of Ubicini, and availing myself of other sources of authentic information, the following estimate of the Roman Catholic population of the Turkish Empire may be laid before my readers as the most reliable that can be arrived at.

By that estimate the Roman Catholic Rayah population in the Turkish Empire would in reality amount to 804,000, thus distributed:—

Latins under their Patriarch . .	540,000
Maronites ditto of Latin church . .	140,000
United Armenians ditto . . .	35,000
United Greeks and Melkites ditto .	55,000
United Chaldeans ditto . . .	25,000
United Syrians ditto	9,000
Total . . .	804,000

And if we add to this number the amount of the Frank population of Roman Catholic subjects of France, Austria, and the Italian States, resident in the Turkish Empire, estimated by Ubicini at 100,000, the total number would be of Roman Catholic Rayahs, and Franks in Turkey, 904,000.

At present, everyone of the different Christian sects in Constantinople is under the control of a head, by whom the whole number is represented, and who can exercise, in particular cases, both civil and criminal jurisdiction. They keep registers of births, and some of them can pronounce a divorce between man and wife, but none of them can decide in cases of litigation concerning patrimony. The patriarch of the Greek Church is styled "Your Holiness," and in the four patriarchates he has eighty-six metropolitans; independently of him are the four archbishoprics of Cyprus, Litidsha, Scarpatho, and Mazzovo. The Armenian Church owns four different patriarchs,—the principal at Constantinople, the others at Sis, Achtamar, and Jerusalem. These have altogether seventy bishops under them. And the Catholic Armenian Christians have their patriarch at Constantinople; he governs the Syrian and Nestorian branches of his church, and has twenty-two dioceses under him. The Roman Catholic Church is likewise represented and governed by its patriarch, who has under him three archbishops, as many metropolitans, besides pontiffs, bishops, and priests. Besides this, all foreigners who are Catholics, but who have become subjects of the Porte, have their own officers to superintend their civil affairs; since 1850, when they were first recognised, the Protestants have been allowed their own representative. And finally, the Jews have in Constantinople their high priest, with seven Arch-Rabbis, and ten Rabbis; this sect numbers from 150,000 to 170,000.

The Latin community (in the Turkish division of Rayahs), strictly speaking, consisted of all Roman Catholic Rayahs, who were subject to the Porte, under the jurisdiction of the Latin patriarch of Jerusalem, whose See in that city was re-established in 1847, by a concordat with the Pope.

The Latin Patriarch's jurisdiction is exercised in different parts

of the empire by sixteen delegates, or apostolic vicars, some of whom are archbishops, and ten are bishops.

Most of the Latin archbishops and bishops receive annual grants, from the funds of the "Societé pour la Propagation de la Foi." The archbishop of Constantinople receives from 30 to 35,000 francs annually for himself and his clerical establishment, and has also a fixed income from France.

The Latin Catholics of Constantinople have eight churches in Pera and Galata. These churches and their establishments of clergy, of France, Italy, and the Greek Islands, are by special treaty placed under the protection of France and Austria.

The condition of the Latins is generally more prosperous than that of other Rayahs, Christian, and Jewish, and consequently they are regarded with jealousy by the other Rayahs, and especially by the Greeks, who seek every opportunity of attacking them and injuring them. In Constantinople they employ all their influence to bring the loyalty of the Latins into bad odour, to thwart the measures of the Vakeel of the Latins, a delegate appointed by the Porte, and assisted by a permanent council of four dervishes, who represent the Roman Catholic community at the Porte, regulates Kharadji imposts, receives their complaints, and lays them before the Government. The protectorate functions of the Vakeel, however, are more nominal than real advantages to the Roman Catholic Rayahs, especially in the provinces.

In Syria the Catholics never think of having recourse to this functionary in their troubles and grievances, they seek redress generally through the medium of their Emir, or directly from the Pachas, and other minor authorities of the chief towns of their several districts.

In the provinces the Greeks bring their great numerical superiority and weight with the authorities to bear on their mortal enemies, the Latins, and in the minor Courts, and divans of Pachas and Mudirs in the Medjis and municipal Councils they contrive to harass and oppress their Catholic adversaries very effectually, and most frequently, with full impunity.

In 1852, M. Ubicini states, the Greek bishop of Scio prohibited all the orthodox Greeks, the faithful of his diocese, from holding any intercourse, or commercial relations with the Roman Catholics of the Island, and none of his flock daring to disobey the interdict, many of the Catholic families were ruined in consequence, and compelled to quit their country.

The leaning of the Turkish Government to the Greek community, M. Ubicini states, is too apparent. However, in the case of the Greek Bishop of Scio an act of tardy justice was done by the Porte, on the promulgation of a second interdict, which occasioned the loss of a considerable portion of the crops, and of the taxes, the people were called on in vain to pay. The conduct of the Greek Bishop of Scio and his promoters was condemned by the Porte.

On the suppression of the Jesuits, Pope Pius the 6th, confided the Roman Catholic mission in the Turkish empire to the order of the Lazarists of St. Vincent's rule, whose head quarters have been at Constantinople since 1776.

The missionaries of this order have establishments throughout the Levant. The Latins have neither churches, schools, nor hospitals of their own in Turkey. At Constantinople, Salonica, Smyrna, and Beirout, they use the churches and schools, founded, or maintained by the Lazarist missionaries. In Alexandria they use those of the Franciscan order, as well as those of the Lazarists. To the protection and liberty of the French Government the Lazarists are chiefly indebted for the advantages they possess in the Levant. During the last twenty years the Jesuits have settled and commenced small establishments in some parts of the Lebanon, which other missionaries had not penetrated, in virtue of the protection accorded to the Roman Catholic Rayahs, and exemption procured for them from some oppressive imposts to which other Rayahs are subject, through the influence and interference of Roman Catholic Embassies in Constantinople.

It has been stated in several Roman Catholic journals in

the months of October and November, 1860, that vast numbers of the Bulgarian community professing the tenets of "the orthodox Greek Church" have come over to the Roman Catholic religion, or manifested their decided purpose so to do, in the event of their national hierarchy and liturgy being recognized by the Pope. I have read in some journals of four millions of Bulgarians having on these terms proposed re-union with the Church of Rome. The latest and best informed statistical writer on the subjects relating to the Ottoman Empire, M. Ubicini, estimates the number of the Bulgarian community at three millions. When we have further reduced the number of persons of this community who have manifested a desire to be re-united with the Church of Rome, to as many thousands as there are really millions belonging to the Bulgarian community, we shall perhaps be nearer the mark.

A very able and well-informed writer on the Roman Catholic religion, Mr. Wilberforce, in his observations on this subject says:—"The different Christian races who live under the Turkish yoke regard one another with detestation, to the solidity of which the feeling of Celts against Saxons in Ireland is a mere shadow. One effect of this hatred is a constant endeavour of each people to get rid of all interference of its neighbours with its ecclesiastical concerns. The same jealousy is not felt against the French, who are the recognised representatives of Catholicity in the East, nor against the Russians, and the Christians of Turkey are happy to make use of either of those powers to free them from the detested yoke of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. Thus in 1848 the Sclaves and Roumans of Transylvania took the opportunity of the revolutionary movements in Europe to deliver themselves of that yoke, and now the Bulgarians, who have been for years at open war with the Phanariote clergy, and have been demanding Bishops and priests of their own race, and a national Patriarchate, are on the point of separating themselves from the old centre of schism. The Patriarch and Synod of Constantinople, who well knew their object, have long refused to ordain for them any Bishops

or Priests not of Greek origin, and the quarrel has at length come to a head.

"In this the Bulgarians are only obeying a tendency which is more or less in operation in all the Christian nations of the Turkish Empire. The Bosnians, Moldavians, Wallachians, and Servians, are all progressing towards separation from Byzantium. New Rome is being treated as she served old Rome, and her rebellious children are simply imitating her own conduct. The whole Patriarchate of Constantinople is in a state of disintegration; and this fact evidently increases the gravity of the Bulgarian movement, which may, as our French Correspondent says, be only the example which the other Eastern Christians will make haste to follow.

"But this feeling will not account for the submission to Rome. The tendency of the Bulgarians was always supposed to be towards independence, and a Patriarchate of their own. But since the Crimean war, a new influence has penetrated the East; sympathy with France has sprung up both in Russia, and the Sclavonic, Roumanic, and Bulgarian provinces of the Turkish Empire. They wish, as of old, to preserve and strengthen their national demarcations; but they wish also to inoculate their nationalities with the French spirit. This friendly feeling towards France tends to make the Oriental Christians look favourably on all that constitutes French life, and to remove their contempt for the Latin religion. Perhaps the Syrian expedition has strengthened this view, and made the Christianity of the East recognise in France something more than a mere example and model—a powerful friend, and zealous protector.

"To these three feelings, intense nationality, detestation of the Greeks, and simple faith in France, we may add an historical tradition, as constituting the chief causes of the present movement nearly a thousand years ago. In 866, Boris, King of the Bulgarians, sent his long hair to St. Nicholas I, as a sign of his submission to St. Peter and his successor. His idea comprised an ecclesiastical independence of Constantinople,

the establishment of a special Patriarchate for Bulgaria, and the attainment of Papal protection for the foundation of a new Catholic empire in Eastern Europe. Boris had preluded his conversation with a copious effusion of blood; and Rome, suspicious of his character, acted with great deliberation. Four years afterwards 870, Byzantine Priests won him back to Constantinople. In after years the Bulgarians were again united to the Church, but their return served only to set their inconstancy in a fresh light, and to prove the small amount of judgment which presided over their conduct.

"The movement of reconciliation is only beginning, and may be easily checked either by political or religious misunderstandings; we have not been without the most pregnant examples of such miscarriages within the reign of the present Pope. When Monsignor Ferrieri was sent to the Sultan to announce the accession of Pius IX., a deputation from the Armenian Consistory presented to him a formula of their faith, and demanded on this basis to be admitted to Catholic Communion. The formula was completely orthodox, but the movement failed through the demand of Monsignor Ferrieri that the nomination of the Patriarchs and the Bishops should be in the hands of the congregation of the Propaganda. About the same time a magnificent opportunity for the re-union of the Copts to the Church was spoiled by the interference of the English Consul at Cairo. France, which is usually supposed to be the protector of Catholic interests in the East, took no interest in this movement, and found no means to counteract the machinations of the British agent. Either of these causes may easily upset everything in the matter of the Bulgarians; the Bulgarians, in common with other Orientals, have an especial hatred for the Roman congregations; and if they fancied that they were to be subjected to the Propaganda, or, the congregation for the revision of Oriental liturgies, instead of to the Pope in Consistory, they would be likely to fly off at a tangent. Doubtless, also, the whole political influence of the English interest with the Porte will be brought to bear on the re-unionists; and it will require

both honesty and energy on the part of France to countermine Protestant intrigue. Perhaps Napoleon the III. may see in this, as he saw in the Syrian expedition, a means of calming the outraged feelings of the French Catholics, and of reconciling them in some measure to his Italian perfidies; we cannot suppose that any other motive but self-interest could force the ally of Victor Immanuel to undertake the cause of Catholicism in the East. Still it *is* the recognised idea of France to adopt this character.

"The movement, as we said, is only beginning as yet; the declaration has been signed by one Bishop and his clergy, and about 2,000 laymen; about one hundred villages have also given in their adhesion to the plan; the declaration was concerted with the Latin Patriarchate of Constantinople, and has been placed in his hands for transmission to the Holy Father. The following is a summary of its contents:—

"First; the Bulgarians commemorate their conversion by SS. Cyril and Methodius, who left them a national hierarchy, in communion with Rome; the Greek Patriarchs of Constantinople criminally dispossessed them of these rights; the Bulgarians could do nothing but protest; but now the measures of the present Sultan, who has proclaimed liberty of conscience, allows them to make a more energetic protest against the violence which imperils their morals, shuts them off from all intellectual development, and delivers them over to the tyranny of a foreign and 'antichristian' priesthoood. Burning with the desire to preserve their ancient faith, the Bulgarians have determined to break with the Greek Patriarchs, and to re-unite their Bishop at Constantinople to the Holy See.

"After this preamble they recognise as holy the doctrines of the Church of Rome, and promise a full and sincere fidelity to the Pope and his successors, and their apostolic delegates. They, however, feel sure that Rome will allow their rites and liturgies to remain intact, and beg the Pope to recognise their distinct and national hierarchy as canonical.

"Finally, they humbly beg the Pope to invite the French

Emperor to intervene with the Sultan on their behalf, that the independence of their hierarchy may be recognised, and that they may be protected from all intrigues whether of the Greeks or others. And they beg the French government to give them the same protection which it gives to other Catholic nations of the Ottoman Empire.

Such is this movement, which, may result in the wholesale reconciliation of 4,000,000 Christians to the Holy See. Nothing can be further from our thoughts than to disparage the importance of the fact; our only idea is, to point out the mixture of motives which actuates the chief movers, and to hint that as their motives are not simply religious, not simply spiritual, many a side wind may blow them out of their course."

The Latin Greeks and Melkites of the Latin church in the Turkish Empire, amount to 55,000. The Melkites are the Roman Catholic Greeks of Syria, where their race was predominant up to the time of the Saracen conquest. It was only under the Pontificate of Clement XI. they were recognised as a Catholic community in union with the Roman Church, and certain immunities were then granted to them. About one half their number inhabit Mount Lebanon, where they have three monasteries.

They were governed by a Patriarch, who resides in Damascus, and is likewise titular of Antioch and Alexandria, and has nine suffrages under his jurisdiction, bishops of Aleppo, Beirout, Sour (Tyre), Sarda (Sidon), St. John d'Acre, Bosra, Zabeli, Balbek, and Damascus. Their ritual is in the Arabic tongue, and according to the Greek ritual.

The Chaldeans in union with the Church of Rome, amount to about 25,000. They are not to be confounded with the Kurds. Ubicini ascribes their origin to the ancient warlike race of mountaineers established in Central Asia, who peopled the cities of Assyria and Babylon. A fragment of the Chaldean nations subverted by the Persians, was converted to Christianity, it is said, by St. Thomas and St. Thaddeus, and resisted the persecution of the Sabean idolators, till the beginning of

the 5th century, when the heresy of Nestorias penetrated amongst them. The portion of them who remained faithful to the Latin Church preserve the name of Chaldeans. They dwell principally in the city and surrounding plains of Moussoul. Their patriarch resides in Moussoul. The Chaldean Roman Catholic Church is governed by him, and seven suffragan Bishops. Their common language is Arabic. Their national dialect is taught in the schools; it is nearly the same as the Syriac, differing mainly from it in pronunciation, and the written characters of the alphabet.

The Syrian community, in union with the Roman Catholic Church, is of the same origin as the Chaldean, as the language will testify, though some difference exists, ascribable to more intercourse of the Syrians with Greeks and Romans, than the Chaldeans. The heresy of Monophysitism crept into the Syrian Roman Catholic community in the 6th century, and still maintains its ground.

Its followers, well known in Arabia in the time of the Caliphs, named Jacabites, are still a numerous sect, exceeding in number those in communion with the Church of Rome; the former are estimated at 64,000, the latter at 9,000. The patriarch of the United Syrians formerly resided on Mount Lebanon, but the present titular, a prelate exercising the functions of patriarch, has transferred his residence to Aleppo, to be nearer the followers of his church. He has eight bishops under his jurisdiction.

The Maronites in communion with the Church of Rome, are of Syrian origin. They derive their name from a holy man of great fame for sanctity, named Maro, or Maroun.

A distinct account of the Maronites will be found in a succeeding chapter.

THE JEWS.

The Jewish community of the Turkish Empire are estimated by Ubicini, at 150,000. They probably amount at the present time to 175,000. They reside chiefly in cities and towns, in the

principal trading ports of the Levant, and are engaged chiefly in the business of brokers, money changers, and in retail traffic in the bazaars. They are by no means opulent as a community, nor so actively engaged in commercial pursuits as the Greeks and Armenians. They are divided in the Levant into two sects, the Rabbinists, and the Karaites, and are quite as inimical to each other as those of the Greek and Latin churches.

In the 16th century they occupied many posts of importance and confidence in Constantinople under the government, and in the several embassies and consulates, as secretaries and interpreters, and in commercial and monetary establishments of an extensive kind, as agents, factors, and foreign correspondents. They were then renowned for their learning, and intellectual culture, as their ancestors had been in Spain; and were particularly skilled in the Eastern languages. But progress was not congenial to them, and in the active competition of the Fanareot Greeks, and the Armenians with them, they allowed themselves to be beaten down and supplanted, and ever since their decline, have degenerated more and more.

The affairs of the Jewish community are the best regulated, however, of any of the rayahs of the Turkish Empire. They are more charitable, perhaps than any other community, so far as the exercise of benevolence goes in their own population.

Apostacy amongst them exists only in the fertile imaginations of enthusiastic missionaries in the Levant, and the credulous minds of good, easy men in comfortable circumstances, and pious old women in distant lands, addicted to the reading of Missionary reports.

As an element of resistance to Turkish rule that can ever become formidable to it, the Jewish population of Turkey can hardly be taken into account.

The Jews of the Levant have no sympathies with Russia, and to the Christian populations of Turkey they have the most mortal antipathies.

It is at least, for those who take an interest in Ethnographical researches, a subject for the most profound reflection,

that while the fragments of Christian populations, scattered throughout the Turkish Empire, after four hundred years and upwards, of persecution and spoliation, still count in their several communities, many hundreds of thousands of members; the fragment of that Jewish population of Palestine, which at the commencement of our era, amounted to some millions, is now comprised in the scanty numbers of one hundred and fifty or seventy thousand.

It is a very curious circumstance, that two hundred and twenty-five years ago, the Jews obtained from Sultan Selim II. in 1576, the privilege of having two printing presses, one at Constantinople, the other at Salonica. But unfortunately the issues from the Israelitish press, were calculated to benefit only their own community. Copies of the Hebrew Scriptures were multiplied in the east, and several commentaries on the *Torah*, the five Books of Moses, were published, and some Jewish literary disquisitions on subjects within the limits of the little Hebrew literary and religious Goshen of their community, were printed. A short lived impetus was given under the reign of Selim II. to the literature and philosophy of the Jews. But it did not last; not a trace of this tincture of learning and science of the Jews in 1576 is to be found in the Jewish community in any part of the Turkish Empire in 1860.

In its stead a kind of philosophy prevails which is overlaid with rabbinical learning.

Opulent Jews frequently leave large sums of money for the foundation of schools and libraries, for the education of poor students, and the religious instruction of their community at large, but the study of the Tealmud and its commentators is alone promoted by these foundations, and I never could ascertain that mere secular instruction derived any advantage from them beyond facilities for learning to read and write, and to attain a grammatical knowledge of the Hebrew tongue. But let it be always borne in mind, that no people ever suffered such undeviating persecutions as the Jews have done in Christian countries, and that the unhappy fugitives

from them constitute the present communities of Jews in the Levant, into whose minds feelings of isolation, and sentiments of attachment to their religion and its law has been burned by Christian oppression and intolerance.

Sale has made an astounding observation with respect to the proselytizing powers of Protestantism, and the glorious destiny reserved for their exercise, namely, the conversion of Mohammedans.

"The writers of the Romish communion (says Sale), in particular, are so far from having done any service in their refutations of Mohammedanism, that by endeavouring to defend their idolatry, and other superstitions, they have rather contributed to the increase of that aversion which the Mohammedans in general have to the Christian Religion, and given them great advantages in the dispute. The Protestants alone are able to attack the Koran with success, and for them, I trust, Providence has reserved the glory of its overthrow."*

This is a very curious observation coming from a man of high intelligence, from an Oriental scholar, a zealous champion of Mohammed, an apologist of the law of Islam; and obviously a person more of a German rationalist in his religious opinions than a member of the Church of England. One of the rules he lays down for Protestantism in its future mission for the conversion of Mohammedans, is—"To avoid teaching doctrines against common sense; the Mohammedans not being such fools, whatever we may think of them, as to be gained over in this case."

He observes, moreover, it is not dogmas, Protestantism must think of teaching the Moslems; but it must "bring them over to the ancient and primitive faith."

Sale possessed, in an eminent degree, the art of concealing his religious sentiments, and seeming to express opinions that were in vogue in his day with those for whom he wrote. Like other philosophers who soar above sects, and strike out from old

* Sale's Koran, Preliminary Observations.

systems and established religious principles, but are afraid of their efforts to rise or advance being too closely observed, curiously considered, and ultimately known, and who make the profane vulgar only partially acquainted with the thoughts, aims, and ends, at which they drive; Sale often deemed it necessary to mystify his sentiments, to take certain formulas from orthodox Protestant writers, supply them with some new words, that overlaid the sense, and adopt them apparently as they originally were, pure and simple expressions of sound Protestant opinion.

Let it be observed how Moslems are to be converted to Christianity, on Sale's showing; it is not dogmas they are to be taught, but they are to be brought over to the ancient primitive faith.

How are they to be made acquainted with the fundamental doctrines of Christianity, if no dogmas are to be taught? Is the ancient primitive faith a religion independent of those fundamental truths or doctrines? But what grounds had Sale for believing Protestantism was destined to overthrow the Koran? All enlightened Protestants know a great missionary spirit does not belong to it. All the efforts of English missionary societies have not been able to endow it with that spirit in foreign lands. Upwards of one hundred and twenty years have transpired since Sale published his translation of the Koran. How many Moslems have been converted in that period? I have known intimately the Protestant missionaries, both English and American, in Turkey, Syria, and Egypt, and was closely acquainted with the labours, and the results of the efforts, of those zealous and estimable persons, for four years; and all my experience would lead me to the conclusion, that their mission, as far as the Moslems are concerned, have been utter failures; and that any success that has attended their labours, with respect to the Jews and Christians of those countries, has been confined to the most worthless, abject, venal and degraded of both these religious communities.

That was my experience, and the result of all my enquiries from 1824 to 1828. It was my experience in 1840, and again in 1860.

But Sale's opinion, with respect to the power of Protestantism to overthrow the Koran, has been frequently appealed to, and it has been acted on extensively, especially in Syria. It has been adopted by missionaries, by English travellers, and *by English Consuls.* Nay, it has become a part of the duty of English Consuls to act on that opinion, to write despatches in relation to it; to carry on an everlasting war of intrigue, and interference on behalf of the affairs of Protestant missionaries, and against the labours of Roman Catholic priests and prelates, and the influence of France and Russia in regard to the custody of the holy places, or the protection of Christian Rayahs of the Greek or Maronite churches.

This new polemical policy, with the cares of which English consular authorities in Syria are now charged, is the means of keeping up a spirit of petty, underhand hostility, a system of mean, prying, eavesdropping hostility between the consuls of the different nations.

This pseudo religious policy of ours in the Levant, of keeping up consular contentions "for an idea" is exceedingly injurious to British interests. And the worst of it is, the injury is done them for an absurd idea; for the promotion of objects which are not successful—of Protestant proselytism in the East.

The destiny has not been ordained for it that Sale and his followers imagine. Another, and a very different mission, has been given to it, or taken on itself—the promotion of the civilization that is the result of commerce and agriculture, carried to the highest pitch of perfection, the attainment of wealth, the conglomeration of it in a few hands, the acquisition of vast territories and political advantages.

Sale is not contented that England should have these benefits—he claims for Protestantism, power which is not in it.

The rivalries and contentions of the Roman Catholic and Protestant Missionaries, especially since the expulsion of the Egyptian forces under Ibrahim Pacha, and the unfortunate removal of the Emir Bechir from the government of the Lebanon,

whose Druse and Maronite population he ruled with a strong hand, but with great advantage to both for a great many years, had especially since 1840 involved the different consulates, but especially the French and English, in the polemic controversies carried on between the missionaries of both countries; and, in fact, rendered the consuls of both nations less political and diplomatique agents of their governments, than servants and partizans of Bible societies and missionary institutions.

Van de Velde, in his work on Syria and Palestine, vol. i. p. 132, referring to missionary labours in 1851 and 1852, gives a curious account of the method of converting the Christians and Jews of Syria to "true Christianity," on the part of English and American missionaries. It is to be borne in mind that M. Van de Velde is an enthusiastic champion of those missionary labours, and looks confidently to their success in Protestantizing the East.

He says in 1842 the English missionaries "sent a colporteur from Beirout with tracts to Hâsbeiya, and it was from this man that the people first learned to attach to the term Protestant the meaning it bears among them, 'a true Christian.'"

But the good effects expected from this pioneer of true Christianity and his pack of tracts, were rendered abortive by the Greek priests. The *Colporteur* had no sooner scattered his tracts and taken his departure than the Greek priests, "found means, in their hatred of *the Gospel*, to get possession of the *Books* and burn them." So here it ekes out that the *Colporteur* was not only the bearer of tracts, but Bibles.

This mode of stealthily scattering the Gospel and the glad tidings of salvation contained in the tracts of "the true Christians," is worthy of attention. Good Mr. Van de Velde says:—

"It was about this time that the Emir imposed certain new taxes, which caused great dissatisfaction. These taxes fell particularly hard upon the poor, who had no protector, and the thought occurred to them, 'We may possibly find protection from the missionaries, they are merciful men.' In this hope

forty-five of them went to the brethren at Beirout, to enrol themselves as Protestants under their protection.

"The missionaries did not of course interfere with regard to the tax, but they 'expounded to them the way of God more perfectly;' showing them at the same time how much true faith in the Son of God differs from such nominal Protestantism as has its origin in mere secular motives. The brethren then sent them back to Hâsbeiya, with Bibles and tracts, promising to give them spiritual help, if their future conduct should attest the sincerity of their wishes. Shortly after, the missionaries found an opportunity of sending two native preachers to Hâsbeiya, who had, in a few days, a hundred and fifty people in attendance on them, desirous of receiving instruction. This was too much for the priests. The Bishop threatened to excommunicate all who should adopt the Protestant heresies; but seeing that this threat had no effect, he had recourse to that powerful weapon, by which in the East justice and right are so constantly assailed.

"The head of the Greeks of Hâsbeiya is the Patriarch of Damascus, a certain Mathôdios, who is also the Emir of Hâsbeiya, and is subject to the Pacha of Damascus. The Bishop of Hâsbeiya had no difficulty, though his superior in Damascus, in purchasing from the Pasha an order to the Emir, to the effect that the heretics should be brought back by force to the Greek Church. The Emir obeyed but too willingly. The new converts had to endure the bitterest persecutions. They were pelted with stones, and spat upon in the bazaars; they were beaten and insulted in their houses as well as in the public places; they were no longer safe anywhere, and were debarred all social intercourse. Many attempts were made even upon their lives; and so severe was the persecution to which they were exposed, that at one time, all but three, who remained faithful, drew back; but around those three forty others soon gathered. After consultation, they agreed that it was best to disperse; and quitted Hâsbeiya to take up their residence at Abeyh, or elsewhere in Lebanon. In this attempt, however, they failed; the

means of earning their bread were wanting; and after a few months, they were compelled to return to Hâsbeiya. Then arose, in the silent night, from their closed dwellings, many a heartfelt and united prayer to the Lord of the Church; eagerly and trustfully His promises were sought out from His Holy Word; and, like the phœnix rising from the flames, the youthful Christian congregation lifted its head anew. Persecution had no longer any terrors for them. At the request of the Patriarch the Emir ordered his janissaries to drive them with scourges to the Church; but his wrath was unable to compel them to kiss, or worship the images. A certain Choûil-Chouri, himself the son of a priest, but now converted to Christ, was sent by his family to Constantinople; here by the help of the Armenian brethren, he obtained a firman from the Sultan, granting freedom to the Protestants of Hâsbeiya. Some amelioration in their lot was the happy result, but only to a certain degree, for the artful Mathôdios managed, during five weary years to bribe the Pacha of Damascus to assail them with all kinds of secret, social persecutions.

"Thus hath the Saviour planted here a vineyard for Himself, 'which He doth keep, which He watereth every morning, which he keepeth night and day lest any hurt it.' * * *

"I asked Mr. Thomson what could be the reason that the noble Syrian plain should be so utterly deserted and untilled, and received the following reply:—This country is government property; if anyone rents it—for buy he cannot—there comes the tax-gatherer, to decide how much he can produce, and the tenant is charged with a fifth of the estimated crop. Unless the tenant bribe this functionary he is sure in ordinary circumstances to be rated at much above what the land can afford to pay. The consequence is, that people avoid as much as possible renting land from the government; or, if anyone venture to sow and reap, he instantly hurries off with his crop, before the tax gatherers can interfere to prevent him.'

"'But,' said I, 'how comes the government to own so much land?'

"'In various ways. Often through the confiscation of the landed property of those, who, for some cause or other, have been found obnoxious, to the penalties of the law. On the occurrence, too, of small local insurrections, which are not uncommon. Thus, for example, the noble valley of Aytûn had belonged, for sixty years past, to the Emir of Hâsbeiya. But the Pasha of Akka, having revolted from his lawful sovereign the Sultan, he made himself master of several parts of the country, and among others, of the district of Hâsbeiya. The Merj Ajûn next fell into his hands. The Sultan sent troops against the rebel Pasha; the Emir of Hâsbeiya was restored to his independence; but as all the land that the Pasha had appropriated was confiscated, the Merj Ajun became the property of the crown. Ibrahim Pasha, the Egyptian general, afterwards conquered Syria, and the Merj Ajun became a possession of his. Syria passed again out of his hands into those of the Sultan, yet the soil of that fertile tract only exchanged one iniquitous master for another. And so, when the population had no other resource but that of renting from this oppressive government the ground which they must cultivate in order to procure a livelihood, they are compelled to abandon such districts. I have seen,' said Mr. Thomson, 'whole villages depopulated in this manner.'

"My breast glowed with indignation at the thought of the iniquity and oppression with which this poor people are trodden down. How comes it that slavery in the far west should fill the hearts of the nations with sympathy, while they forget this other slavery in the East—a slavery beneath which, in another form, whole millions are sighing? How is it that England should submit to so many immense sacrifices in loosing the bonds of heathen slaves in America, and yet protects the Sultan of Turkey, and makes every effort to maintain the independence of the Turkish Empire, without paying the least regard to the blood and tears of its Christian subjects? Not a book do we find written on Palestine that does not lament over the violence of its oppressors. The country had one short breathing time

lately, and that was when Mohammed Ali wrested it from the Sultan's grasp. Yet it was England, raised as she has been to be the first among nations, and called by God to vindicate the cause of the oppressed, that, in 1840—41, subdued Syria and Palestine for the Sultan."*

PROTESTANTS IN TURKEY.

"During a long period the only Protestants in Turkey (says Ubicini) were the Europeans residing in the different cities and trading ports of the Levant; it is only since 1831, that we find English and American missionaries flocking to Constantinople and other parts of Turkey, for the purpose of making Protestant converts, with the aid of the Bible Society. Their efforts have had but partial success; and although the correspondence and reports of different societies speak (but indefinitely) of the "increasing number of proselytes," it does not appear that the results have been commensurate with the zeal manifested, or the great sacrifices incurred. This want of success has not been occasioned by any obstacles raised by the Porte (the Ottoman Government, immoveable in its apathy, as in its principles of toleration, having left the field entirely open), but is rather to be found in the fact that Protestantism, with its rigid and severe forms, has little chance of success by its own attractions in the East, where above all things an appeal should be made to the eyes and the imagination. Thus we find that within twelve or thirteen years from the time of their first appearance in Turkey, the Protestant missionaries had made but very few converts. The missionaries, perceiving this, without abandoning the conversion of the Jews (which was the object to which they had almost exclusively devoted themselves), began to turn their attention to the Christian subjects of the Porte, and particularly to the Armenians, who seemed to be more vulnerable than the rest.'

"We accordingly find, that subsequent to the above men-

* Narrative of a Journey through Syria and Palestine, by Mr. C. W. M. Van de Velde. Vol. i. pp. 132, 197.

tioned date, the Protestant missionaries maintained a constant intercourse with various Armenian families, and that many members of this community assiduously frequented the Protestant churches on Sundays and festivals. After 1845, the number of Armenians who had thus *de facto* broken through their allegiance to the church was so considerable, that not only the patriarch, Monsignore Matthew, thought himself called upon to exercise a stricter surveillance over his flock, but that Russia *(in quality of protectress of orthodoxy and even of non-orthodoxy in the East) took alarm*, and addressed energetic remonstrances to the Porte through the medium of her ambassador. She instigated the Greek Patriarch to fulminate an interdict against the new dissenters, and even to obtain certain repressive measures against them, which were conceded by the weakness of the Porte; and which, exaggerated by public rumour, soon assumed the appearance of a persecution, and called forth the intervention of the representatives of the two great Protestant Powers at Constantinople—England and America. 'From this moment,' says an English writer, whose unfair treatment of myself, personally, I shall abstain from imitating, 'there began a series of persecutions in the metropolis and principalities of the empire. The converts were everywhere cited before the episcopal synods, and every means tried to compel them to abjure their new creed. Of those who refused some were delivered up to the Turkish authorities, and incarcerated: others, fettered as maniacs, were sent to an Armenian madhouse; some, again, were exiled to distant provinces, and exposed to misery and privations of all kinds. The victims naturally laid complaints before the two Protestant ambassadors, who, thereupon addressed serious remonstrances to the Porte, but the credit of Sir Stratford Canning himself was forced to yield to the influence of the Armenian bankers, secretly instigated by Russia.'

"The natural consequences ensued. These rigorous measures only served to aggravate the evil they were intended to repress, and hastened, instead of retarding the crisis.

"At the beginning of 1846, several hundred Armenians in Constantinople and the provinces, and chiefly in that of Nicomedia, openly embraced Protestantism. A priest named Vartanès, whose character was afterwards called in question, was one of the number. The patriarch, more and more alarmed, and anxious to strengthen the bonds which held his flock to their allegiance, caused a sentence of excommunication to be published in all the parishes of the capital against the new sectarians, enjoining the faithful, under the most terrible threats, to break off all relations with them. 'Whoever,' says the excommunication, 'has among them a son or a brother who has joined the dissenters, and gives him bread, or treats him as a friend, must be made aware that he is nourishing in his house a venomous viper, whose mortal poison will one day destroy him. Such a one gives bread to Judas; such a one is the enemy of the holy Christian faith, a destroyer of the Armenian Church, and an opprobrium to all the nation. Cursed are all the houses and shops of these heretics. We shall inquire respecting those who shall remain in connection with them, and shall mark them out to the Church by terrible anathema.'

"The violence of this document, accompanied by threats, roused the religious passions of the Armenians, and induced them to raise the report of a new persecution, against which report the Patriarch entered a protest in the 'Journal de Constantinople,' April 5th, 1840.

"The Porte, however, foreseeing that there would be no security for the Armenian Protestants so long as the Patriarch retained any civil authority over them, and urged, also, by the remonstrances of England and the United States, resolved to release them from their obedience to their chief, and caused them to be inscribed in the registers of the ihticab-aghassi (superintendent of consolidated duties) for the payment of taxes; recommending them at the same time, by a circular of the Grand Vizier, to the protection of the provincial governors. Four years after the adoption of this measure, which, though it remedied present abuses, gave no security for the future, the

Sultan conceded the complete emancipation of the Protestant Rayahs, permitting them to be recognised as a distinct national body, like the Latins (November, 1850) and to be represented at the Porte by a civil chief of their own. Since this time the Porte has constantly extended to the Protestants all the advantages and privileges enjoyed by other Rayah communities, and confirmed them specially by the firman of the 6th of June, 1853.

"The number of Protestants in Turkey, according to the highest estimate does not exceed two thousand; nearly all belonging to the Armenian nation. They are divided into ten small communities or parishes, three of which are at Constantinople and in the suburbs, and the seven others at Broussa, Ismid, Adabazar, Merzefan, Trebizond, Erzeroum, and Aïntab.

"A small body of Protestants reside at Jerusalem, under the pastoral care of the Prussian Bishop Gobat. The Prussian-Anglican See of Jerusalem was established in 1841, by the exertions of the Anglo-Prussian mission, sent to Palestine for the special object of converting the Jews. Four years after (September, 1845) a firman was obtained to authorise the erection of a Protestant church at Jerusalem. This church, which is unfortunately too large for the limited number of its congregation, was built on the ruins of Herod's palace. Attached to it are a school and a hospital for the use of the converts.

"According to the Statistics of M. Boré, the Protestant community in 1848, under the care of Bishop Gobat, did not include more than forty-two persons; from which it would appear that the success of the missionaries has not hitherto been in proportion to their efforts.

"'But in this country,' observes M. Fairun, 'whether in Syria or Palestine, it will be ever thus with Protestantism. The Anglican mission at Jerusalem, and that established by the Americans in the village of Abéih, on the heights of Lebanon, not far from Beirout, reap but bitter fruits. Man and nature, faith and tradition, are alike hostile to their undertaking. Jews,

Greeks, Christians, Latins, and Turks, all unite for the moment in a sentiment of antagonism.' The comparative inconsiderable success of the Protestant missions, in contrast with the unremitting progress of Catholicism, is thus explained by M. Boré, from the accounts of the missionaries themselves.

"'On arriving at a city or a town, the first thing they do is to visit the bazaars, and other public places, offering for sale at a low price copies of the Bible and New Testament, translated into the dialect of the country. In default of purchasers, who are generally very rare, they leave about the sacred volumes in the most conspicuous spots, hoping they will attract attention and readers, and that the good seed thus scattered abroad may spring up and bear abundant fruit, as if the mere possession of printed copies of the scriptures would make converts of ignorant Arabs, Turks, or Kurds. But even if all these people were able to read, and very few can do so, the translations made for their use are generally too imperfect and faulty to be intelligible to the multitude; and so it often happens, that instead of the happy results the missionaries anticipated, they have the mortification, in the course of a day or two, of finding the only traces of their labours in a few torn and scattered fragments of the sacred volumes trampled under foot in the public streets. The Romish missionaries adopt a different course. They begin by making themselves a part of the population whom they seek to convert, adopting their language and habits, and assimilating themselves in all respects as nearly as possible to the inhabitants of the country. Through heat and through cold they toil on foot over the most savage regions; nor are they ever seen mounted on the backs of mules, accompanied by wives and children, and encumbered by a camp equipage, tents, mattrasses, and all the conveniences of life, like the train of a Pacha travelling to take possession of his government.'

"I am glad to place, side by side with this testimony, which, coming from a Roman Catholic may be suspected of partiality, that of Mr. Slade, an English naval officer, and a Protestant: 'The Protestant missions,' says he, 'are much vaunted; doubt-

less they cost large sums, but the good they do is as a drop in the ocean, compared to the good works of the Roman Catholic Church, silently and modestly performed, in all parts of Turkey.'

"The Catholic missionaries are permanently established, and labour like apostles, in countries which their competitors only visit, or travel through, more after the fashion of gentlemen tourists than missionaries devoted to another world. The difference in the results of their respective labours is thus plainly accounted for."*

The Protestant institution in Jerusalem, under the auspices of the Prussian Bishop, Gobat, and the Protestant Pastor, Valentiner, in 1852 was thus composed, we are informed by M. Van de Velde, in his "Narrative of a Journey through Syria and Palestine," published in 1854, vol. ii. p. 288:—

German Protestants	14
German Roman Catholics	2
Italian Roman Catholics	3
Arab Protestants	10
Arab Greeks	9
Russian Greek	1
Arab Latins	10
Jews	8
Proselytes	12
Coptic Christians	4
Mohammedans	5
Total	78

Of these, forty-six were men, and thirty-two women.

* "Letters on Turkey," by M. Ubicini, Appendix, Vol. ii.

CHAPTER II.

Syria under Mohammed Ali.

The acquisition of Syria was not solely suggested to Mohammed Ali at the time he attempted it, by the general state of domestic affairs in Turkey; for he had not only long before been exerting all his influence with the Porte to obtain the Pachalik of Acre, in addition to his other governments, but he had for several years been laying measures for rendering it subservient to his ultimate designs and frontier policy. Abdallah Pacha, a young man of weak understanding, had succeeded Sulieman Pacha in the government of Acre, and having been instigated by his vanity, and by Mohammed Ali, as he affirmed, to seek the annexation of Damascus to his Pachalik, he forged a firman from the Porte, and ordered the Emir Beshir (who was subject to him as chief of the Christian and Druze provinces of Lebanon) to make a levy of mountaineers, and march against Damascus.

The Emir did so, and advancing to the gates of Damascus, burnt the village of Mezzy, which was near them. This rebellion having been denounced by the Porte, and the Pachas of Aleppo, Tripoli, Damascus and Cæsarea, having united their forces to repress it, the Emir fled, and abandoning Syria, took refuge with Mohammed Ali, while Abdallah Pacha shut himself up within the walls of Acre, where, well supplied with provisions and the means of defence, he sustained a ten months' siege.

In the meantime Mohammed Ali advocated the cause of Abdallah and the Emir at the Porte; the siege seemed hopeless, the affairs of Greece claimed immediate attention—and bribery in aid of all these considerations, prevailed. Abdallah Pacha and the Emir Beshir were pardoned, and restored to their governments, and Mohammed Ali regarded his policy as triumphant, and the interests of his protegées bound up with his interests.

Mohammed Ali, at this juncture, when the power of the Porte was almost paralysed, thought the time was come for the invasion of Syria. Large detachments of Bedouin Arabs crossed the desert from Egypt, and Ibrahim Pacha, with an Egyptian squadron, anchored off Jaffa in February, 1831.

The chiefs of the different races of Syria remained for some time undecided as to the course which they should take, and looked with no small interest to the steps that would be taken by the Emir Beshir. This wily chief, with the caution and astuteness peculiar to the Syrian race, sought to preserve a neutral position in the approaching conflict. He assembled a council of the principal Emirs and Sheikhs of Lebanon, at which it was resolved that no hostile measure should be taken until it should be known what were the sentiments of the Porte.

The Emir Beshir was at length reluctantly obliged to visit Ibrahim Pacha at the camp before Acre; though he still endeavoured to avoid compromising himself, and came down from the mountains attended only by some of his household, and with a present of a few sheep and horses for Ibrahim and Abbas Pacha (Mohammed Ali's grandson), hoping thus to give to his presence a character of mere personal attention to Ibrahim, whose father had been at one time, his benefactor.

Ibrahim, however, having once in his power the Emir's person, that hostage became a security for the conduct of his provinces (left by him under the government of his son, Emir Ameen); nor was he, after a residence of some months at the camp, permitted to return to Ihteddeen, until Ibrahim felt as-

sured of his co-operation, and still further secured it by retaining with him his grandson, the Emir Mahmoud, and compelling the Emir to compromise himself by acting from the camp in his own name, as the Pacha's delegate over all the newly acquired towns wrested from the Sultan upon the coast.

At the conclusion of an eight months' siege, Acre was surrendered, and a rapid march through Syria, putting to the rout the armies of irregular troops opposed to him at Homs and Bylau, brought Ibrahim for the first time, into serious conflict with the Turkish army at Thonia, under the Grand Vizier, in December, 1832. The battle lasted several hours, when the Grand Vizier having been taken prisoner, the Egyptian army prevailed.

Russia alone, of all the European governments, appeared to have prepared for the consequences of this Egyptian invasion of Syria, and the decided position she then took, turned the tide of Egyptian affairs, and gave Russia the commanding influence she lately enjoyed in Turkey.

The negociation and settlement of Kutich succeeded, in 1833. Ibrahim Pacha entered within the limits of the defiles of Adana, and Syria, at a tribute of 6,000 purses annually, and that province was placed under the government of Mohammed Ali.

The conduct of the Egyptian army, on its march through Syria towards Constantinople, was most exemplary for discipline and orderly behaviour towards the people. The professions of Mohammed Ali breathed every design that could promote the welfare of the country; and though he was not sufficiently rigid in many of his opinions to please the more orthodox classes, his power was regarded by all as irresistible, and all were disposed to believe that his administration of affairs in Syria would be favourable to the people.

Europe regarded Ibrahim Pacha with increased consideration. England, ere yet its ambassador had reached the Porte, advanced beyond her colleagues in compliment to the rising

power; and while Ibrahim Pacha was still on his rebellious march to Constantinople, and Russia had withdrawn her Consul General from Egypt, she sent one permanently to reside there, who was invested, for the first time, with a diplomatic character, and an office which was designated with the political distinction of "a mission." Had the Pacha of Egypt at that time adopted the government of Syria, and sought to identify the welfare of an enlightened system for the people with his administration, his position would have been considerably strengthened, and the good wishes of Europe secured for the maintenance of his power.

Ibrahim Pacha was not insensible to these views. Disagreements, however, often arose between him and his father in Egypt, from whom the chief instructions of administration issued, and Ibrahim finally withdrew from any ostensible participation in the civil affairs of Syria.

The Egyptian administration in Syria proceeded consequently upon the same monopolising and infatuated spirit of selfish despotism which had governed Egypt, and wretchedness, rapaciousness, and depopulation, spread in a short time throughout all its provinces of Syria.

The first measure of the Egyptian government in Syria, we are told by Consul Farren, was to introduce a new personal tax, called *Ferdè*, on all the males of the country, from the ages of twelve and fourteen. It was first fixed at sums from fifteen to five hundred piastres, according to the supposed means of the individual. The tax was indiscriminately applied to all classes, and was paid by the Christians in addition to the *Karatch*, or poll tax, to which they had long before been subject—the rest of the population had not been liable to any taxes of a personal nature. The great sources of the public revenue were the *Miri*, or land tax, which varied exceedingly in its rate, but was chargeable in fixed sums; and the *Grallee*, or grain contribution, payable in some cases as a tax, and in others as a ground rent. The fiscal duties were, under the former government, collected in general by its own

agents, but Mohammed Ali invariably farmed them to private speculators. They entered, however, into the public accounts under the head of Mal Miri, or revenue property.

These taxes, which, under Turkish government, had all been most irregularly paid, and were ill levied, and diminished in their progress to the treasury, were not only fully enforced by the Pacha of Egypt, and the chargeable amounts rigidly investigated, but permanent additions were made, where any circumstances of local advantage, or existing comparative prosperity in a district might offer a pretext.

Thus, allowing for all the extortions of government, and local oppression, under the old system, there was a direct increase of fifty per cent. in the regular taxation, and the new impositions of *Ferdè* by Mohammed Ali, amounted alone to nearly one-half of the whole regular taxes formerly levied. It was the same in the other political divisions of Acre and Aleppo, where the former payed 13,000 purses *ferdè*, and the latter 7,000. The substitution of the rule of Mohammed Ali for that of the Sultan, was ruinous to Syria.

The Egyptian system of extortion was more permanent, general, systematic, and extensive, and more impoverishing and irresistible than that which it had superseded.

The government was annually the purchaser of large quantities of grain and of fodder, timber, and oil, &c., for its service. The sale was compulsory, and the quantity was levied, in certain proportions, on the different districts of the province, and the price regulated by the Divan at the beginning of the crops, always favourable to the government. The corn purchased by the government was not paid for at the time, but ran up in account with the taxes. It was not taken from the peasant, as it would be by other purchasers (who paid the market price), nor was it measured according to custom; but the government only received it so sifted and measured as to make a difference of ten per cent. in the quantity, and the villagers were then obliged to convey it, at their own expense, to the government granaries at Damascus, Acre, and the chief magazines, though, in some

cases at two or three days' distance. Besides this, the quantity required was not regulated by the actual wants of the public service, but for speculative purposes of the government; and as grain almost invariably in that country rises twenty, and sometimes to fifty per cent., and higher in price, before the new crop came in, the surplus was sold at that time by government, for its own advantage, though not then perhaps all paid for, to the villagers, and a competition is thus established in every way disadvantageous to the farmers. . . .

A continued requisition has been made on the country for the baggage and marches of the troops from one part to another. On their arrival from, or departure to, Egypt—on their marches into winter quarters, or summer stations—on their concentration at different times, on the northern frontier—during their operations against disaffected parts of the country—and for the transport of provisions, timber, and materials for the government service.

The greatest blow, however, given by Ibrahim Pacha, to the sentiments of the people, and to Egyptian interests, was the forced conscription.

The forced conscription, at different times, has amounted to 35,000 men, or upwards of eleven per cent. on the male population,—a most destructive drain on the industry, population, and productive power of the country. The periods of the forced levies were kept secret, and generally commenced on a Friday; when the mosques were resorted to. At the hour of prayer numerous parties of soldiers were distributed through the quarters of the cities, and intelligence was conveyed to them by the firing of a gun, of the moment to commence. They then rushed on all the citizens who might be in the streets, and drove them to the great square of the Serai, when, having left them in its enclosure, they returned to make fresh captives of all upon their routes. A short time sufficed to spread a thrill of fear and despair throughout the city. Women might be seen rushing wildly through the streets, followed by their children, to seek their husband, son, or father, who but a

few hours before had left them to provide for their daily wants, and now are separated, perhaps for ever from their families, without a parting benediction, or alleviating care or solace for their destitution. . . .

In many cases the fathers and near relations of those supposed to be hid, have been publicly beaten, to extort a disclosure of their retreats; and some have died of the wounds thus received. These scenes were not confined to the cities, but spread through all the villages and hamlets of the country. At Damascus the soldiers were ordered out in the dead of the night, and suddenly fell upon the neighbouring villages, and seized the peasantry while sleeping in their houses. The fields and plough were forsaken at such a time, agriculture, trade, and commerce were neglected; the shopkeepers, peasants, and artizans fled to the hills; and anxiety pervaded the entire country. Whole villages were suddenly abandoned, except by the women.

In this manner upwards of 35,000 of the population have been seized and yoked to a career of rebellion, and the best interests of the country, and the strongest ties of humanity have been sacrificed. . . .

It is not only for the measure itself, but for the total regardlessness of all solicitude for the public sentiment and interest in its enforcement, that the Egyptian government is so deeply reprehensible. Towards the close of 1837, and just after the *ferdè* and land taxes had been enforced, and the country strained to the utmost to discharge them, when the crops had failed, the price of grain had risen nearly 300 per cent., or to twelve piastres the miol—and the winter was beginning to set in with extraordinary severity, and famine and misery seemed before the people—at that very time, not only was the additional requisition for grain rigidly enforced, but scarcely had the old crops been off the ground when orders were given for a general levy of 5,000 men throughout Syria, and the land was suddenly abandoned, the peasants fled in all directions, and the country

was plunged again into a degree of despair, which burst out in that revolt in the Hauran which gave so much trouble to Ibrahim Pacha, and in which so many of his troops and generals had been slain.*

* "The Present State and Prospects of Syria," by John W. Farren, Esq., late British Consul at Damascus. See Lord Lindsay's Travels, vol. ii. p. 233. et seq.

CHAPTER III.

The Greek Rayah Community of the so called "Orthodox Church."—Constitution of the Greek Church in Russia and Turkey.—The Proposed Re-Union of the Greek and Latin Churches.

FULLER states in his "Historie of the Holy Warre, the great schism originated in the time of Pope Gregory the Great, about two years before his death, A. D. 604, that proved an incurable breach between the Eastern and Western Churches." "It originated in the act of John, the Patriarch of Constantinople, who claimed to be universall bishop—Gregory the Great stoutly withstood him." Matthew Paris ascribes this act of John, the Patriarch, to a Greek prelate of an earlier date, to a Greek archbishop going to Rome to obtain the customary confirmation of his new dignity, but the fees that were demanded of him having appeared so exorbitant that he objected to the payment, and returned to his own country inveighing loudly and bitterly against the charges he deemed exorbitant. Meetings of ecclesiastics and murmurings followed, and as the minds of men became more excited by these complaints, parties became more exasperated, and at length war was declared between the churches.

The Greek Church, separated from the Roman Catholic, is divided into three distinct communions:

1. The Græco-Russian, styled "the Orthodox Church."

2. The Chaldean or Nestorian Church, the Patriarch of which formerly resided in Kurdistan, but since 1846 has dwelt at Aurmiah, on the borders of Persia and Turkey.

3. The Constantinople Patriarchal Church, with which all believers in the Orthodox Greek faith in the Ottoman Empire, some parts of Greece, and of the Austrian dominions, and the Danubian provinces are in communion.

The schism of the Greek and Latin Churches, as Gibbon remarks, followed close upon the restoration of the Western Empire by Charlemagne. Originating in the antipathy which the subjects of the old and new Rome had felt for each other, ever since the time of Constantine, this schism began in the ninth century, through the ambitious intrigues of Photius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and was consummated by his successor, Michael Cerulerius, in 1054. It has continued down to the present day, and engenders between the partisans of the two churches an animosity, unabated by the progress of the human mind, during a period of eight centuries.

It is not my intention to enter into all the details of this long dispute. It is known that Photius took for the motive or rather the pretext of this rupture with Rome, the addition of the words "*Filio-que*" to the Nicene creed. The torch of discord between the Eastern and Western Churches had already been lighted by the agitation of the following questions, the solution of which was thought to involve grave doctrinal consequences—"Does the Holy Ghost proceed from the Father only, or from the Father and the Son?" Many councils, and especially that of Florence, in 1439, attempted to reconcile the dissidents. The latter council was specially convened with a view to the re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches. It was attended by the Greek Emperor, John Palæologus, and Joseph, Patriarch of Constantinople. The result of this council was the re-union *on paper* of the two churches.

The *Act of Union*, pronounced at the close of this council, and afterwards subscribed by the Pope, the Emperor, and their principal adherents, created only a momentary concord, all traces of which speedily disappeared. Popular fanaticism proved more powerful than the policy of the Emperors or the dread of the Turks. Greek priests were in the habit of purifying altars

at which a Latin priest had officiated; fanatical monks were incessant in their denunciations of the union, and in preaching the extermination of those they termed schismatics; and the patriarchs themselves, in their writings, excited the people against the latter. These imprudent proceedings were, in a great degree, the cause of the fall of the Empire.

Can it, however, be asserted—it is asked by St. Thomas of Aquinas—that the fundamental doctrines of Christianity were deeply affected by this controversy? True it is that the Orthodox Eastern Church agrees with the Catholic Church, in recognising in Jesus Christ two natures and one person, and in holding that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father; but she rejects the addition of the article "Filioque," introduced by the second Œcumenical Council. She refuses to believe in purgatory, and does not absolutely proclaim the eternity of punishment. These are the only essential points involving schism; other subjects in dispute—such as the worship of images, ecclesiastical supremacy, diversity of liturgies and language, the celibacy of the clergy, the mode of administering baptism, the Eucharist, &c., affect merely the rites and internal discipline of the church.

The schism of the Nestorian Church, introduced by Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, in 428, is also based upon two essential differences; its followers holding that there are two natures and two persons in Jesus Christ, and that the Holy Ghost does not proceed from the Son.

The Eutychian Church, on the contrary, founded on the doctrine of the Archimandrite Eutychès, and condemned by the council of Chalcedon, in 451, acknowledges in Jesus Christ *but one nature and one person;* whence the name of *Monophysite.* This doctrine was introduced into Egypt by Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, and was thenceforth propagated among the Copts and Abyssinians.

The total number in all countries of the schismatics of the Eastern Church, may be estimated at 71,000,000: 64,000,000 of which are orthodox, 6,500,000 Monophysites, and 40,000

Nestorians. Of this number rather more than 13,000,000 belong to the Ottoman Empire; viz., 10,000,000 Orthodox, and 3,000,000 Monophysites; of the latter 2,375,000 are Armenians, and 65,000 Jacobites*

From a passage in the Turko-Grecia History we find that at the close of the sixteenth century, the Patriarch of Constantinople exercised his jurisdiction over all Christians of the Oriental rite. He was recognised as the sole Œcumenic by the three Patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, who nevertheless gave him the title of brother and colleague. He controlled the Churches of Asia Minor, of Greece, of the islands of the Ægean Sea, of the two Mœsias, of the trans-Danubian regions, and even those of Russia.

This Christian Church, with its great community and majority of Christian Rajahs of the Turkish Empire, is termed by its members the Orthodox Church, and by Roman Catholics the Schismatic Greek Church.

At the period of the downfall of Constantinople and of the Greek Empire, many immunities and privileges were conferred on it by the Turkish conqueror, Mohammed II., several of which still remain in force. The church establishment, as it was then constituted, remains still pretty much the same. A Patriarch was recognised as head and Archbishop of Constantinople, having jurisdiction, not only in ecclesiastical affairs, but in civil matters connected with marriage contracts, divorces, legacies, and testaments, and also with those of correctional police of minor importance in his diocese.

The Patriarch was elected by a senate, over which he presided by right. The senate was composed originally of all prelates residing in Constantinople. Its attributes were those of a legislative authority, those of the Patriarch of an executive administration in ecclesiastical affairs. The synod administered the revenues of the Church, and watched over the interests of the Greek community in general, whose members contributed

* Ubicini "Letters on Turkey," vol. ii. p. 118.

to the expenses of the synod, and also to the maintenance of the Patriarchs: the latter likewise derived a considerable income from fees paid by prelates on their installation, from a tax on causes tried before its tribunal, and a yearly contribution from every head of a family, and priests officiating in his diocese, and in the enforcement of his rights the Turkish authorities were bound to assist him.

Every prelate enjoyed in his diocese the prerogatives of the Patriarch at Constantinople, except in these particulars, that an appeal lay from his decisions, in cases of gravity, to the Patriarch, and that all orders emanating from the latter were binding on him. The clergy in their establishments in the provinces, were maintained by fees paid by those who had recourse to ecclesiastical tribunals, by the product of the sale of ecclesiastical functions, and by free offerings in the churches twice a year at episcopal visitations.

The secular officiating ecclesiastics were called the superior clergy; the monks, or caloyeroi, who inhabited the innumerable monasteries scattered over the empire, were called the inferior order of the Greek clergy. The several communities of the Greek church had local magistrates elected by them, of very limited and humble functions, namely, to apportion the capitation tax, to control other contributions, and to provide for their collection. These magistrates have been very pompously designated Municipal Institutions.

The Russian Orthodox Greek Church has had several Russian historians. One of the most recent and enlightened is a Monsieur Mouravieff, chamberlain of the late Emperor Nicholas, and a high functionary of "the most holy governing synod of St. Petersburg," in 1838. This work, translated by the Rev. Mr. Blackmore, was published in London in 1842.

We learn from this author that the old Russian capital of Kieff was the cradle of Muscovite Christianity. Its introduction dates from A.D. 866, to A.D. 1015. Kieff was the seat of the Metropolitan See from 1072 to 1240.

After the Tartar invasion it was removed to Vladimir, and continued there from 1250 to 1308.

It was again removed to the second capital of the empire, Moscow, and there remained from 1328 to 1582.

Job, the first Patriarch of the Orthodox Greek Church, of Russia was appointed in A.D. 1587.

Up to 1690 there has been ten Patriarchs; the last, elected in that year, was Adrian.

The next appointment of a head of the Church, but with minor attributes than the preceding pontiffs, was made in 1701; this functionary was designated the Guardian of the Patriarchate.

Twenty years later a new form of government was given to the Orthodox Russian Church by the Emperor, with the sanction of the dignitaries of the Church reluctantly accorded, or rather wrested from them by the Czar Peter. This new State Church Government, designated "The Most Holy Synod," was instituted in 1721.

The Russian Church, in common with the other Orthodox Greek Churches, claims the Apostle St. Andrew for its founder, who is said to have first planted the cross on the summit of one of the hills of Kieff, the spot on which the ancient capital of Muscovy subsequently rose. But it was not till nine centuries later that the light of Christianity beamed upon Russia from the city of Byzantium, in which capital the same apostle St. Andrew had appointed Stachys to be the first bishop. "Hence the *indissoluble* connection of the Russian with the Greek Church, and the dependence of her metropolitans during six centuries upon the Patriarchal throne of Constantinople, until, with its consent, she (Russia) obtained her own equality and independence in that which was accorded to her native primates."*

Setting aside a vast number of incidents and episodes of

* Mouravieff's "History of the Russian Church," p. 8.

doubtful authenticity in the traditionary annals of the origin of Christianity in Russia, each of which has its accompanying miracle, for the honour and glory of the infantile days of the Orthodox Church, we come to an event in connection with its early history, which serves to fix an epoch in its origin, and to invest its divinity with something of human interest.

In A.D. 992, the Pagan Russian Prince Vladimir demanded of the Christian Greek Emperor the hand of his sister, the Princess Anne, in marriage. The Greek Emperor courteously and Christianly answered Vladimir, he would consent to the proposed marriage, provided the Prince would embrace Christianity. Vladimir, whose heart was set on embracing the Princess Anne, gave his consent to become a Christian, saying: "He had long since examined and conceived a love for the Greek law." With all due respect for the Orthodox Church, and the first Russian Prince that belonged to it, we may take it for granted that Vladimir had conceived a love for the Greek Princess prior even to his love for the Greek law. The Princess Anne, with a good cortège, and a goodly retinue of bishops, monks, and venerable clergymen, sailed from Cherson, and on her arrival induced Prince Vladimir to hasten his baptism, he being sorely affected by a complaint of his eyes. So that the Prince was baptized, married, and cured of his sore eyes, all at once. Several lords and ladies of the Court were baptized on the same occasion, and by the same Bishop of Cherson, who baptized and married the Prince, in the Church of the Blessed Virgin, and so great became the zeal of Vladimir for the Patroness of that church, that a little later he erected a cathedral to her honour, in his capital, Kieff. In a very short time all the citizens of high rank of the Russian metropolis, were all Christians. Vladimir taking a rather strong measure to induce the people to be converted. He issued a proclamation declaring "that whoever on the morrow should not repair to the river (Dneiper) to be baptized, whether rich or poor, he should hold for his enemy."* The whole of the inhabitants of the city, ac-

* Mouravieff, ib. p. 15.

cordingly came to the river, and were baptized *en masse;* "the priests reading the prayers from the shore, and naming at once whole companies by the same name."

Up to 1197, the election of metropolitans of the Russian Church was made uniformly, and *de juré* by the Patriarch of the Greek Church in Constantinople; but in that year a synod of Russian bishops "resolved not to have a Greek again for a metropolitan."

"They all agreed to take the election of a metropolitan into their own hands, without the Patriarch having any participation in the matter. Only one voice, that of St. Niphont, of Novogarod, protested strongly against this infraction of Church unity, and of the canonical dependence of the heirarchy, without which the infant Church of Russia could not rightly subsist."*

The synod elected one Clement, a monk, metropolitan, "and the bishop Onaphries proposed as a substitute for patriarchal consecration, that in ordaining Clement, they should lay on his head the hand of St. Clement, Pope of Rome, whose relics had been brought from Cherson to Kieff by Vladimir."

A religious war was the result of this uncanonical election, which lasted for nearly a century, and involved princes and prelates, towns and cities, in ruin; and was only suspended when another and direr element of destruction came from the East on Russia—the invasion of the Moguls, in 1205,—and in 1240 another irruption of the same hordes, laid the ancient capital of Russia—Kieff—with all its christian temples in utter ruin.

In 1582, Job, Archbishop of Rostoff, was raised to the Primacy of Moscow and all Russia, and from this time the annals of the Russian Patriarchs date.

In 1587, an event of great importance in the Russian Church took place. The Turks were then, and had been for one hundred and thirty-four years, in possession of the Greek Empire,

* Mouravieff, ib. p. 35.

and all its cities. Two Greek Patriarchs of Antioch and Constantinople, had visited Moscow, soliciting pecuniary aid for their churches, then terribly oppressed by the Mohammedans.

An idea which had originated seven years previously in 1580, namely, of establishing a Russian Patriarchate, independent altogether of the Greek Patriarchate, was now taken up by the Czar Theodore, and pressed on the Patriarch of Constantinople, who was then in Russia, Jeremiah II. This dignitary of the Greek Church had suffered for the faith, in Rhodes, and had been imprisoned there by Amurath I.

The Muscovite Church was then depending on the Greek Patriarch for its canonical privileges, on this poor outcast Patriarch Jeremiah, then a fugitive from the seat of his jurisdiction, in a country ruled over by Mohammedans. The Czar Theodore, proposed to the Greek Patriarch Jeremiah, to remain in Russia, and to set up his Patriarchal throne in the city of Vladimir. The Greek Patriarch piously and prudently declined to assent to the tempting proposal, being unwilling to compromise in any degree, the interests of his own see and seat of jurisdiction, and returned to Constantinople.

The Czar Theodore then turned his thoughts towards the metropolitan of Moscow, Job, and proposed to the synod of bishops, to enter into negociations with the Greek Patriarch, Jeremiah, for the creation of a distinct and independent Patriarch of the Greek Church, and carried with a high hand his supreme will into effect. The complaisant synod of bishops, and what is more surprising, the complaisant Greek Patriarch, obeyed the orders of the Czar, and the new institution of a Patriarchate of Moscow was duly established. So the Russian Church had an independent existence from 1587.

The Czar Peter the Great began to meddle in the spiritual affairs of his Empire in 1700, in a manner calculated to give umbrage to the Patriarch and metropolitans; but whatever offence was taken by the rulers of the Church, no opposition was hazarded to the will of Peter. The ferocious autocrat changed ecclesiastical usages, though of minor importance,

without deigning to consult the prelates and clergy. He transferred the festival of the new year to the 1st of January, to make it conformable with the customs of other European countries, without troubling the ecclesiastical authorities with any consideration of the subject.

The Patriarch, however, resented this interference with his authority by refusing to officiate at the solemn liturgy, in the Czar's presence at this festival. Peter next announced his intention of reforming the laws, and defining the limits of the civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction.

The Patriarch, then in a dying state, in vain issued orders to ecclesiastics to make collections of the Imperial decrees, according immunities and privileges to the Russian Church, furnished these collections to the secular functionaries charged by the Czar with the legal reforms he commanded, and besought them to respect the sacred rights of the Holy Orthodox Russian Church.

The worthy Patriarch died the latter end of 1700, and the Chamberlain of the Emperor Nicholas, M. Mouravieff, in his history of these beginnings of the enslavement of the Russian Church by the Czars, ventures only to observe:

"The Patriarch departed this life the end of the year 1700, and with him the personal dignity of the office of Patriarch in the Russian Church came to an end."*

It is a remarkable circumstance, that two Princes signally remarkable for assigning to themselves spiritual missions, claiming and exercising the right of interfering in councils and synods in matters appertaining to Church government, have been men of furious passions, cruel, unrelenting, and unnatural.

Constantine, who meddled much in matters of religion, had his own son put to death in a fit of rage, and infurious for revenge.

Peter the Great was continually meddling with the govern-

* Mouravieff, ib. p. 262.

ment of the Church of his nation; he, too, had his son condemned to death, and was only spared from shedding that son's blood by the sudden extinction of life from the effects of terror on the young man's mind occasioned by that sentence.

In 1721 the furibund autocrat of all the Russias, determined on a fundamental change in the constitution of the National Church of Russia. He went through the forms of consulting metropolitans, bishops, and archimandrites, of having synods convoked, and the proposed change in the Church deliberated on by them. Peter's daring project for enslaving the Orthodox Church, and making it the bond servant of the State, was committed to a courtier prelate, Theophanes, Bishop of Pskoff, and successfully carried through the synod.

The decree ordaining this great change, was signed and sealed by the Czar Peter, and seven of the highest functionaries of the State, and received the signatures of the guardian of the Patriarchal throne, two metropolitans, four bishops, and six archimandrites, and all the Hegumens of the first rank in the Russian Church.

Immediately after this solemn act and declaration of the will of the autocrat was ratified and executed by the ecclesiastical council, and the grave aspect of a sacred formula given to it, the new ecclesiastical institution for the government of the Orthodox Russian Church, was opened with all due pomp and solemnity in the presence of the Czar. This institution was called "The most Holy Governing Synod of the Orthodox Russian Church."

This synod was a spiritual body, permanently established to rule and govern the Russian Church. This title was inserted in all the litanies and places in the liturgies wherein the Patriarchs were formerly mentioned, as the head rulers of the Church. To its administration were committed all the estates, landed and other property of the bishops and monasteries which had previously been under the ecclesiastical management.

The election of bishops, right of jurisdiction over spiritual persons, except in capital cases, which were to be tried in the

different courts, all matters of heresy and schism, questions concerning marriage and divorce, previously belonging to the Patriarchal Court of Requests, and later to the metropolitan's jurisdiction, were now referred to the jurisdiction of the synod.

The former chief ruler of the Church, the metropolitan Stephen was named President of the "Most Holy Governing Synod," with the same voice in its decisions as the other members. There were two Vice-Presidents, both of them archbishops. The other members were one archbishop, six archimandrites of as many monasteries, two hegumens, one priest monk, and two arch priests. Such was the original composition of the "Most Holy Governing Synod."

The patriarchal headship of the Church, was in fact substituted by the new synodical institution, the working of which was virtually in the hands of the Czar.

In the valuable notes to M. Mouravieff's work, we find the following observation as to the dependence of the synod on the Czar :—

"The synod has been substituted for the Patriarchate. The appointment of the members of the synod as they change, depends chiefly on the will of the Emperor, as supreme governor of the Church, and the representations of the High Procurator."

When a vacancy occurs in a bishopric, the synod proceeds to select three ecclesiastics as being worthy of nomination. The list with the three names of eligible persons for the episcopal office is then sent to the Czar, who is supposed to consult the synod before he elects one from the list of the three eligible persons, and to be guided by its views of fitness for the vacant office.*

The Patriarch of the Orthodox Church in Russia, whose patriarchal seat was in the ancient capital of Kieff, and if not dependent on, was long subordinate in rank to the Patriarch of

* Mouravieff's "History of the Church of Russia."

Constantinople. In course of time that dependence or subordination, was abolished, and about a century after the independence of the Russian Patriarch was effected, Peter the Great abolished the Patriarchate, appropriated its revenues, and instituted in its place a synod for the regulation and government of all temporal matters and affairs appertaining to religion, and its relations with the State, by its constitution wholly dependent on the Czar.

At the beginning of the 18th century the Czar, Peter the Great, obliged the synod to declare and acknowledge him head of the Orthodox Church of Russia. The synod is composed of Metropolitans and Archbishops, under the presidency of the archbishop of Novorogod, and of a lay delegate, who presents an annual report to the Emperor.

The prelates of the Synod are supposed solely to have cognizance of matters concerning faith and morals; and neither the Czar nor the lay delegate claim a right to interfere in ecclesiastical affairs, or in aught that relates to rites, doctrine, or discipline.

Nevertheless, if he chose to usurp and exercise such a right, it is very clear there is nothing to prevent him in the composition of the Synod. And it is even questionable whether the title conferred on him by the servile Synod, might not authorise him to interfere in the spiritual concerns of a Church of which he is the head—recognised by the superior prelates of the Church.

SEPARATION OF THE GREEKS FROM THE LATIN CHURCH.

The Greeks from the time they separated from the Latin Church, continued to recognise four Patriarchs in conformity with the decisions of the council of Chalcedon, in the year 451, those of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, the supremacy being in that of Constantinople. At the close of the 16th century the Patriarch of Constantinople exercised

his jurisdiction over all Christians of the Oriental rite. The Church under his jurisdiction had long previously assumed the title of "The Orthodox Church." The Patriarch, or Œcumenic chief of this Church governed the churches of European Turkey, of Asia Minor, of Greece, the Islands of the Ægean, the two Mœsias, the trans-Danubian provinces, and even those of Russia.

In the vicissitudes of the Turkish Empire, Churches shared the fate of provinces. Several churches were separated altogether from the jurisdiction of the Œcumenic Patriarch of Constantinople.

At the present time the total number of persons professing to be of the Greek Church, not in communion with that of Rome, in all countries, in Russia, Turkey, Greece and Austria, is estimated at 71,000,000, of whom 64,000,00 are of what is called the Orthodox Church, 6,500,000 Monophysites, and 40,000 Nestorians.

The appellation of Greek (Roum) in official language is not applied exclusively to the populations of Hellenic origin, subjects of the Porte. It is used to designate indiscriminately all those of its Christian subjects of whatever descent, who recognise the civil and religious jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople.

The number of subjects of the Porte under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and forming the Greek nation or community, may be estimated at 6,000,000. Of this number rather less than two millions are Romans (a name given to the Greeks of Turkey to distinguish them from the Hellenes); the rest are almost entirely Sclavonian.

The Greek race is dispersed throughout the whole empire, but in unequal proportions. In European Turkey it forms about the eleventh part of the whole population, in Asia Minor it scarcely amounts to the twenty-fifth part; whilst in the islands it may be calculated at three-fourths. Metellin contains 60,000 Greeks out of 80,000 inhabitants; Rhodes 28,000 out of 38,000.

The Greeks of European Turkey, are in number from 950,000 to 100,000, about one-half of whom inhabit Constantinople and Thrace; the remainder are found in Thessaly and other provinces, sometimes in isolated bodies, sometimes intermingled.

The Greeks of Syria and Asia Minor are dispersed throughout the seaports of the Levant, from Trebizond to Jaffa, and St. Jean d'Acre. Their numbers decrease in proportion to the distance from the coast; and beyond a certain limit they are only found in great commercial towns, frequented by caravans; such as Angora, Alleppo, Damascus, &c.

The agricultural population consists almost exclusively of Turks, Armenians, and Kurds.

Among the immediate subjects of the Porte, of Sclavonic origin, the Bulgarians hold the first rank.

Their number may be computed at not less than three millions, or three times that of the Greek population of European Turkey.

The Greeks despise the Sclavonians, calling them barbarians, and *kondrokephalai* (wooden heads), as they did even in the time of Michael Palæologus, 1261; on the other hand, the astute and wily spirit of the Greeks is utterly repugnant to the Sclavonians, who regard them with jealousy and distrust.

Next in order come the Servians of Bosnia and the Herzegovine, in number about 1,500,000, about one-third of whom are Mussulmans, and the Servians of Metotria. This name is given to that portion of Albania, which extends over the districts of Prezzina (the ancient capital of Servia, under the King Douchan) or Prichtina, and of Novi Bazar. The Sclavonic population of this country may be estimated at two hundred thousand.

The Vlaques, or Zingaris, sometimes classed with the Greeks, sometimes with the Sclavonians, belong in reality to neither of these races. Originating, as their name indicates, in Wallachia, whence they emigrated at different times into the

southern provinces, they sprang like the Wallachians of the Danube, from the Roman colonies which Trajan sent into ancient Dacia. . . .

"A document recently published at Athens computes the number of Zingaris dispersed through Greece and the Turkish provinces of Thessaly and Macedonia at 600,000.

"This is probably an exaggeration, as the number in Turkey itself does not appear to exceed 200,000 or 220,000 individuals. In recapitulation we have:—

Greeks	2,000,000
Sclaves	4,400,000
Bosnians and Herzegovinians . .	1,000,000
Bulgarians	3,000,000
Metotrians	200,000
Montenegrins	200,000
Vlaques or Zingaris . . .	200,000
Total . . .	11,000,000

If we subtract from this total about 600,000 Catholics (Greeks, Bulgarians, Bosnians, &c.), belonging to European Turkey, we shall find that of the remaining numbers six millions will fairly represent the effective strength of the Greek community in the Ottoman Empire."* Of the above mentioned eleven millions the portion belonging to the Greek race is very small. The following passage is from a pamphlet by the Rev. W. G. Schauffler, D.D., one of the missionaries, published some years since by the Turkish London Missionary Society:—

"The vast number of so-called Greeks in the Turkish Empire is a mere illusion. Their true number is 2,050,000. The other so-called Greeks are in reality Bulgarians, Bosnians, Albanians, &c. &c."

"The Christian population of Constantinople (says the Abbé

* Letters on Turkey, by M. Ubicini, vol. ii.

Michou) is considerable. The Greeks, not in union, are about 100,000; the Armenians, not in union, about 80,000; the Latins, 12,000. As there is no regular official census of the population of the Ottoman Empire, the numbers obtained are not always very precise. Thus, I was told by some persons, that there were a million and a half Armenians in the empire, whilst others raised the number to three millions.

The Greek Patriarch, who is named Anthimos, is about seventy years of age. He is an able man; takes the title of œcumenical patriarch of the great church of Constantinople. He is the head of the synod, which consists of twelve members. These members are archbishops, *in partibus*, whose dioceses are governed by vicar bishops, called archimandrites.

"There is some property belonging to the Greek churches, of which the bishops have the usufruct. Each parish also makes an annual collection for the bishops. Four or five laymen, forming a commission, go to every house with a register, and receive the offerings of the faithful. The collection in the churches on Good Friday is applied to the same purpose.

"There are some bishops whose revenues are considerable. A bishop of Macedonia was mentioned to me, who has 1,000,000 piastres (250,000 francs): the archbishop of Smyrna has a million and a half of piastres.

"Every bishop is obliged to pay an annual fine to the Patriarch, and this sum is considerable, because the bishops are absolutely dependent upon him. He can remove them at pleasure. To do this he issues a decree, which is sanctioned by the synod, and the Turkish authority executes the sentence. Every bishop or archbishop gives money to keep his office; and the Patriarch thus obtains a considerable income."

The Christian populations in the East were placed by the powers given to the Patriarchate in a very anomalous position.

In M. Borè's work, published in 1847, we are told,—"The Patriarch of the Christian communities denominated Milleti, remaining invested, not only with all their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but also with a certain judicial power which

enabled them to inflict on the members of their flock not only fines but bastinadoes and imprisonment; it followed that the members of the Greek, Armenian and other churches were subject to two distinct authorities."

The Turkish government incurred not only the odium of its own acts of cruelty and oppression, which indeed were more than enough to damn it, but the damage done to character and authority by the oppressive acts very often of the dignitaries of those churches of the Rayahs.

And secondly, because their priests have been always faithful to the principles of nationality of the masses, and have at all times, and in all the provinces of Turkey, more than participated in their patriotic sentiments, if I may so speak of their aspirations after independence, and detestation of their Turkish oppressors: nay, stimulated, revived and encouraged them when they became faint or of diminished energy, vigor, and virility.

This is a very considerable fact, a circumstance well deserving of notice, that a priesthood exceedingly illiterate, in fact, without a tincture of secular learning, and very little knowledge of the history of their own church, nay, most slenderly provided professionally in relation to their own ritual canons, and theological controversies and decisions, a clergy extremely poor and burdensome on that account to the peasantry and working classes generally, who possess no influence in high places, and have sprung out of the ranks of the poor and industrious, should yet have such a strong hold of the people's hearts and affections; and should have, for upwards of four centuries, retained their power and influence over the Greek population of the Turkish Empire, attached to their church and to their religion. The same observation applies to the relations between the priests and the people of Russia.

I doubt if in *this age* there be as much sincere strong faith abounding in enthusiasm in any Roman Catholic country in Europe, with one exception, as there is in Russia.

I desire to be understood and not mistaken or misrepresented

on this subject, which I think is an important one. I believe the Russians are perfectly sincere in their religious sentiments, and generally speaking, not only decorous but devout in their religious practices, and especially in their veneration and reverence for the Blessed Virgin, and firmly confident in the efficacy of prayer for the intercession of The Pania.

I know that their co-religionists in Greece, and throughout the Turkish Empire, who are no less attached to their religion and their Church, though by no means practically such worthy members of it, have not the most remote knowledge of the distinctive characters of the Greek and Latin Churches; that they are ignorant, far more ignorant than any Roman Catholic people in the main now are in matters of religion.

Roman Catholic travellers in the Levant are amazed, hardly less than Protestant ones, at the constant recurrence of genuflexions (Metanoia) in the religious ceremonies in the Greek Church generally, but in the monasteries there seems to be no end of them. In some services they are repeated three hundred times in succession. In these muscular *exercises* (of the knee joints especially) and in repeated diurnal repetitions of offices, consisting chiefly of portions of psalms and multitudinous prayers chaunted in monotonous, sing-song, nasal intonations, the poor Greek caloyers pass the greater portion of their lives. I have often marvelled that the fact never seems to have occurred to those who framed those liturgies and offices of such inordinate length, who multiplied so exceedingly those wearisome genuflexions and monotonous intonations, those long, diffusive prayers and psalms, of equal length, on which the Rev. Sidney Smith has descanted, namely, that we are not living in antediluvian times, when men attained the good round age of eight or nine hundred years, and that compositions for our days of three or four score years at the utmost, should be correspondingly abridged and abbreviated.

But whatever evidences of obliviousness of our greatly reduced term of existence we find in the liturgy and ritual of the Greek Church, in the religious services and offices of the

monasteries, especially in regard to multiplied forms and illimitable formulas of prayer and psalmody, in one respect the clergy of the Greek Church seem to have some notion of the present limited period of men's lives, the enfeebled energies of their physical constitution, and impaired capabilities of organic endurance, and of the lessened power of human patience—*Their clergy preach short sermons.*

Have the clergy of the Latin, and the Lutheran, and Calvinist Churches nothing to learn from the ecclesiastics of the Greek Church? Is there no antediluvian theological circumlocution of boundless space in the latitude and longitude of their limits of power of lung and tongue in the pulpit?

Oh, spiritual guides and shepherds of all our churches, for heaven's sake, for poor humanity's sake (constituted as it now is, short lived and full of miseries, of manifold infirmities, of corporeal energies easily exhausted, of powers of attention and patience speedily worn out), study to preach short, learn to compress, strive to strike home to the heart, and cease to be diffuse and soporific, or ornate and dogmatic for one mortal hour in the pulpit!

The frequency and rigour of the fasts in the monasteries of the Greek Church, exceed anything of the kind in usage in those of the Latin Church.

"At the commencement of Lent, nearly three whole days, Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of Quinquagesima week are passed without eating or drinking; the kitchen and refectory are closed, and the first meal permitted is on Wednesday afternoon at three or four o'clock. The same austerity is practised at the conclusion of Lent; from Holy Thursday the monks remain without food till the following Saturday evening; oil and wine are forbidden during Lent, and the rest of the year they fast on Mondays, Wednesdays and Fridays, except in the interval between Easter and Whitsuntide."*

The Greeks have four Lents (tessaracosti) in the year, one

* Les Actes des Apostles Modernes, vol. ii. p. 81.

before Easter lasts eight weeks; one after Pentecost, three weeks; one of the Holy Virgin, in August, fourteen days; and one before Christmas, of forty days. They have, moreover, three fasts, one of twenty-six days, before the feast of St. Demetrius; one of four days for the festival of the raising of the cross; and one of eight days in honour of St. Michael, preceding his festival. They have, also, all the Wednesdays and Fridays in every week, and at certain periods, Monday, also; finally, they have three vigils, namely, of the Epiphany, St. John the Baptist, and of the Cross, making a total of 238 days in the year in which they must either fast or abstain from flesh meat, fish, milk, butter, and cheese. So that there remains, out of the 365 days of the year, 127 clear days for the unfortunate member of the Orthodox Greek Church to "eat, drink, and be merry," without ecclesiastical restraint on his pantry, larder, and kitchen, and religious interference with his stomach and palate.

THE GREEK SECULAR CLERGY OF THE ORTHODOX CHURCH.

The miserable income of the priests of the Orthodox Greek Church, derived from the exercise of ecclesiastical functions, would not enable them to live, if they had only to support themselves; but those who are married, and have families to provide for, a very large portion, and perhaps the largest number of them, could not possibly exist, and obtain the means of existence for their families, without having recourse to manual labour of some kind in aid of their very slender professional resources. Their mode of life is of the simplest and most frugal description; it scarcely differs from that of the peasantry amongst whom they are located. I have lived in their houses, and often shared, for many days together, their humble fare, and am competent to speak of their condition. I have had ample means, too, of forming an opinion of their

social qualities, domestic laws, and moral conduct, and my experience is favourable to them in all these respects.

They are, with very few exceptions, as far as my experience goes, of irreproachable morals, strictly observant of religious duties, simple and sincere in their belief, frugal of necessity, and from choice, habit, and religious influence, temperate, kind and affectionate to their families, and charitable as far as their circumstances enable them to be.

Ignorant indeed they are, and to an extent that would seem almost incredible. Very few are acquainted even with the general nature of their own doctrines, or with the ancient language of their own ritual, and the writings of the Greek fathers.

They are compelled by their indigence to be importunate in urging their pecuniary claims on their flocks, but however pressing they may be for payment of their dues, I am very far from believing that they are either exorbitant in their demands, or oppressive in their dealings with the poor of their communities. They are sincerely attached to their religion, and, with very few exceptions indeed, without knowing exactly on what specific grounds; they are very strongly opposed to the name and reputed tenets of every other Christian Church, those especially of the Roman Catholic Religion.

It would be equally in vain to inquire of them and expect to obtain from them a plain outline even of the fundamental doctrines of their Church and of the Roman Catholic religion: and much more hopeless would it be to get any definite statement of the differences which separate the two Churches. In the monasteries one would have a better chance, than among the working secular clergy of getting information on such subjects.

Travellers are disappointed when they converse with the poor Greek priests on the mission in the Turkish provinces, in the islands of the Ægean, and even in the Hellenic kingdom, and expect to find an accurate knowledge of those important differences. But they discover that the Councils of Nice and Chalcedon are hardly known even by name, and with respect

to the "filioque" cause of contention and dissidence, that they are in a state of primœval innocence.

They are in contented, if not blissful ignorance of everything in the Latin Church, except of the existence of a Pope, of baptism by immersion, and the employment of unleavened bread in the Eucharist; and, holding the religion of the Latins therefore in abhorrence, they glory in belonging to "The Orthodox Church."

Ubicini gives a very striking illustration of the state of decadence of the Greek Orthodox Church, continually undermined, as he thinks and considered it to be, so late as 1849. He says, as description would convey feebly the impression of the evils which these corruptions—namely, simony, superstition, fanaticism, and imposture entail on the people, he prefers to retail a conversation which he held with a Greek of Smyrna, during the holy week of 1849.

Of this conversation I will only cite a few passages in corroboration of other statements in this volume on the same subject:—

"Alas!" exclaimed the Greek, "Busbequius,* does not exaggerate when he declares that our priests make money of everything, the episcopacy, the priesthood, baptism, the communion of the dying, the holy sacraments, and the dignities of the Church, are all alike bought and sold. You may accuse yourself to the Pneumaticos† of no matter what crime, absolution certainly follows if you pay in proportion to the offence; for every sin with us has its price. The same holds good with regard to divorce, excommunication,‡ and the other abuses so frequent in our Church. Nowhere is the maxim, that the priest must live by the altar, practised on so grand a scale, and at the same

* See Lettres de Busbeq, 1748, vol. i. p. 122.

† Pneumaticos in the Greek Church,—the priest who receives confessions.

‡ Excommunications are very frequent in the Greek Church, and often on grounds unconnected with religion:—For example, an individual who has been robbed, may get his whole household excommunicated until the guilty party declares himself. The bishop, however, is the principal gainer. He is paid for pronouncing the excommunication, and also for removing it.

time with so little scandal, as with us, for even those who suffer by the system are not shocked at it."*

The Orthodox Greek Church permits its secular clergy (parochial ecclesiastics) to marry, with certain limitations; the marriage of a papas, or priest, must precede his entrance into holy orders. He cannot espouse a widow, and in the event of his wife dying, he cannot take a second.

In Turkey he must wear a band of muslin round his cap, as a distinctive mark of the married state; and so long as his wife lives, he cannot attain to any higher office in the Church than that of a Prolo-papas. Celibacy is strictly required of the higher orders of the Greek clergy.

In Turkey, however, this interdiction with respect to the latter is taken little into account.

Parishes of considerable extent, and schools connected with them, are placed under the management of civil magistrates—"Eppores." The subordinate parochial clergy are paid out of the parish funds, derived from alms, collections in churches, surplice fees, &c.

The priests in the minor towns in the provinces, and in the villages throughout the country, "are wretchedly poor," and, I must add, wretchedly ignorant; but by no means, I must affirm, immoral, ill disposed, or unmindful of their obligations, so far as they understand them, to their flocks, or at least the poor, industrious portion of them, with whom alone they come in contact. Their income is derived from fees of small amounts, contributions from the peasantry for performing the house blessing, at the beginning of every month, called "Aghiasmos." Out of his slender means the country priest has to pay a portion of his dues to the bishop of his diocese, and a fixed sum of two ducats at Easter and the Epiphany, under pain of excommunication. The country priests are in continual dread of incurring this penalty, or of being interdicted for very slight transgressions in his office.

Of the inferior clergy of the Orthodox Church of the Greeks

* Ubicini, Letters on Turkey, vol. ii. p. 158.

in the Turkish Empire nothing favourable to their position, attainments, or acquirements, can be said. Let us take the ecclesiastical establishment of a parish and its church, designated Ephimeria.

The first clerical functionary—"Præstos," officiates in rites and ceremonies, such as baptisms, marriages, and burials. It is his office to recite the Lord's Prayer, Creed, &c., &c., in the ritual.

The second—"Pneumatico," or confessor—must be at least forty years of age, and have a written license from the bishop.

The third—"The Papas Ephimero"—his office is to recite the liturgy, to chant the matins and vespers, and assist in all the church ceremonies.

Then follows the Deacon and choristers, the Canonarch, or reader, who recites hymns; and lastly, the sacristan, or beadle (Candelanaptis), literally, candle lighter.

Ubicini deals, I think more severely with the Greek priests than they deserve:—

"They have no conception of Christianity but in its external rites, and can only teach others what they believe and practise themselves. Their whole religion consists in the constant repetition of the sign of the cross, in attending mass, in kissing the pictures which adorn the templon (or screen), and in the strict observance of Lent and the other fasts. . . .

"Still these village priests, notwithstanding their poverty, which scarcely raises them above the level of the lowest peasant, and their ignorance, which retains them where their poverty has placed them, are far more estimable than the dignified clergy. Their fanaticism, a necessary consequence of their ignorance, is at least perfectly sincere, and it is by their influence alone that the people have been preserved faithful to the religion of their ancestors. . . .

"If he cannot otherwise instruct he can teach them patience by his own example, and give them some consolation under present ills by the recital of traditions and pious legends, which

announce, in a speedily approaching future, the fall of the Ottoman domination, and the final triumph of the cross. Thus it is that faith has survived among the people, and with faith, nationality. The farther we go from the capital, and remove from the influence of the Patriarch and the synod, the more striking does this result become. In the Morea the priests, and even the bishops never omitted to mingle national recollections, and hopes of an approaching national restoration with the doctrines and rites of religion. When the insurrection broke out, the clergy were the first to take up arms, and their example was all powerful in rousing the rest of Greece. Let not such things, however, be expected from our bishops and metropolitans. I would not, with Zallony, accuse them of intentionally riveting the chains of our country by working in concert with Turks and Fanariotes, to debase the national character. The animosity of Zallony towards the Fanar has led him into exaggerations; but when has a Patriarch ever refused to launch the thunders of his Church against his brethren guilty of rebellion against the Turks? Think of Rhigas, and more recently still, Hypsilanti. Perhaps you will say the Patriarch was compelled to act as he did. Granted; but a man may always choose between the committal of a base action, and death."*

The deposition of a Greek Patriarch does not disqualify him from again being elected; several have been deposed—some as many as six times—and subsequently re-elected. Crusius, in his Lives of the Patriarchs, states that from 1453 to 1574, thirteen Patriarchs were deposed or imprisoned, two abdicated, four have been put to death; one was poisoned, two were put to the sword, in the reign of Mohammed IV., in 1651 and 1657, in times of panic, on suspicion of high treason; and so late as 1821, the venerable, innocent, and good man, the Patriarch Gregory, on suspicion of treason, wholly groundless, was executed by the orders of the Sultan Mahmoud, so much cele-

* Letters of M. Ubicini, vol. ii.

brated for his reforms, especially in the Janissary Institution, of a very sweeping description.

The metropolitans are of two classes—Gerontes, ancients; Panicrolati, most holy.

The suffragan bishops are called Despotès, masters; and also Theophilislate (very dear to God).

The metropolitans and archbishops are nominated by the synod: they appoint their own suffragans.

Every new prelate has to pay an enormous contribution to the Patriarch, varying from £150 to £750 sterling.

The synod of the Greek Church styles itself—"The Servants of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople, and the metropolitans of the synod holding council."

When a Patriarch is elected or deposed, there are delegates of the rulers of all the principal churches present in addition to the twelve metropolitans, the bishop and lay clergy, the secular notables of the capital, under the presidency of the highest ecclesiastical dignitary present, in the absence of a Patriarch, and since 1847, three lay members, in virtue of an order from the Porte, notwithstanding the strenuous opposition of the Patriarch, as an innovation contrary to the holy canons and immunities of the Patriarchate.

The Porte, moreover, delegates a commissioner, who is present during the election, and at its termination. The Porte endeavoured to get rid of the remonstrances of the Patriarch by declaring it was not intended the lay delegates should take any part in the spiritual concerns of the Church, deliberated on in the synod, as to doctrine or discipline, nor a direct part in the appointment of archbishops. This step of the Porte is the introduction of the small end of the wedge of temporal power interference in ecclesiastical affairs.

The claims of Russia to a protectorate over the Rayahs of the Greek Church in the Turkish Empire, are based on the Treaty of Kainardji, of 1744. By article 7, of that treaty, the Sublime Porte promises to protect the Christian religion and the Greek Church; and the Imperial Court of Russia is allowed on all

necessary occasions, to make representations concerning persons in the Turkish Empire connected with the Greek Church.

By Article 14th, "permission was given to erect a public church of the Greek religion in the street called 'Beg Ogalou,' in the suburb of Galata." By Article 18th, "Russian subjects were to have full liberty to visit Jerusalem, and no contribution or tax was to be exacted from these pilgrims and travellers." By Article 19th, "Russia restored the islands of the Archipelago to the Sublime Porte, with this reservation, that the Christian religion in them should not be exposed to the least oppression, and that no obstacle should be opposed to the erection or repair of churches of the Greek community, and that their clergy should not be oppressed or insulted.

The Patriarchal income of the head of the Orthodox Greek Church in Constantinople, derived from fees paid in his chancelry, contributions from prelates on their appointments or preferments, the collation of curacies, a tax on causes brought before his tribunal. The whole of his revenue amounts to from £3,000 to £4,000 sterling, annually.

From the time of the conquest of Constantinople for some years it was customary for the Sultan to present a gift annually of £100 a year to the Patriarch. Mohammed II. commenced this munificent custom, but it did not long survive.

The jurisdiction of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople (still ostentatiously styled æcumenic) is limited, at the present time, to the Greek churches in the immediate possession of the Sultans, viz., Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia, part of Epirus, Syria, and some other regions in Asia Minor and Egypt. He exercises a direct authority over six millions of "Orthodox Believers," of whom two millions are Greeks, and four millions Sclavonians.

The churches of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, are under the jurisdiction of their several Patriarchs, each having a synod, but without any civil authority, and claiming independence of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople.

Of the 71,000,000 members of the Greek Church, separated

from the Roman Catholic religion, there are in the Turkish Empire, according to Ubicini, in round numbers 13,000,000.

Of the Orthodox Greek church .	10,000,000
Of the Monophysites . . .	3,000,000

The latter include 2,375,000 Armenians; and Jacobites, 65,000.

In 1843 a spiritual war broke out, and was carried on for several years, on account of the Greek synod of Jerusalem claiming to elect their Patriarch, without reference to the Patriarch of Constantinople. This contest threatened a schism in the Orthodox Church, within the last four years. The Greek Patriarchate of Jerusalem was erected in 418 and confirmed by the Council of Chalcedon in 451. The Patriarchs of Jerusalem have been always elected by their own synods, notifying their election to the other Patriarchs. This Patriarchate is the poorest of all. It appears in no small degree anomalous, that the Patriarch of Jerusalem should reside chiefly with a portion of his clergy, at Constantinople. At Balata, a suburb adjoining the Fanar, fourteen metropolitans and bishops, most with honorary titles of sees, acknowledge his jurisdiction.

The Greek Church of Servia, from the 13th century, enjoyed the right of nominating its own metropolitans, and consecrating its own bishops, having broken the connection with the Patriarch of Constantinople. In 1340 their prelates in synod in the city of Scopia, elected a Patriarch of their own, styling him Patriarch of Servia, Bulgaria, and Illyria. The Patriarch of Constantinople in synod, lost no time in excommunicating the new Patriarch and all his clergy. This anathema in 1376 was taken off by another Patriarch of Constantinople, who recognised the rights of the Patriarch of Servia.

At the expiration of four centuries the Patriarchate was abolished, in 1766, when, after the manner of Polish partition, there was a dismemberment of Servia, and a portion passed into the hands of the great territorial highway robber—Austria. The

Patriarch of Servia under Austrian rule—Carlowitz, the ancient seat of the Patriarch being occupied by that Power—dwindled down into an archbishop.

The three principalities of Wallachia, Moldavia, and Servia, now fiefs only, and tributary territories of the Porte, having administrative governmental institutions of their own, are governed in religious affairs by their respective metropolitans who, at their installations pay a contribution to the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople.

The Hellenic Church, that of liberated Greece, by a declaration of the first assembly or provisional government of Calamata in 1821, confirmed by a decision of the clergy assembled at Nauplia the 4th of August, 1833, and by a statute of the Holy Synod of Constantinople, the 11th of June, 1850, promulgated its independence, acknowledging no other supremacy in the constitution of its government, than that of a permanent synod of bishops presided over by the Metropolitan of Athens.

MONKS AND MONASTERIES OF THE GREEK CHURCH.

The Eastern Church differs in one respect particularly from the Latin Church—the paucity of Monastic orders. The rule of Basil and that of St. Anthony, with few exceptions, from the earliest to the present time have been those of the Greek Church. The Greek monks are divided into two classes—*cenobites*, or ordinary communities, and anchorets (idiorithmes) who live separately, unless on certain festivals (in recent times) when they eat in common.

Each monastery is governed by a prior (hegvumenos), whose office is for life, or in his absence or non-existence of one by a providor or steward (epitros), elected annually by the community.

The brethren are divided into ordinary monks (monachi) and consecrated monks (ieromonachi), the latter are the learned

portion of the community. Their time is divided between employment, religious duties, and manual labour, cultivation of the grounds of the monastery, providing food and other necessaries, tending cattle, and domestic affairs.

Formerly, monasteries abounded in all the provinces of European Turks, especially in Bulgaria, Thrace, Macedonia, Thessaly, the Morea, and the Islands of the Ægean, and on the sea borders of Asia Minor. Among those still existing the most remarkable are those of Mount Athos, Meteora, Mount Sinai, and of the Princes Islands.

The Greeks designate Mount Athos, "the Holy Mountain," and in this designation is comprehended not only the peak of Mount Athos, but the Peninsula of about forty miles in length, by nine at its greatest breadth, between the gulfs of Contessa and Monte Santo, which forms the eastern extremity of Macedonia.

Mount Athos, snow-capped, even in summer, rises in the centre to a height of about 6,000 feet with a base of about seventy miles in circumference. Numbers of vast enclosures, Cenobite towns on a small scale, formerly existed on the sides of the mountain on lofty peaks, inhabited by monks, and several still exist, but the number of inmates is greatly reduced. Two of the existing monasteries on the west side founded by a king of Servia in the twelfth century, are occupied by Bulgarian monks, who perform their rules and offices in the Sclavonic tongue. One monastery for Russian monks was founded by the Empress Catherine.

Several hermitages are scattered on the highest peaks, tenanted by anchorets called Philerèmes. At the present time the number of monasteries in the district of Mount Athos is about twenty. There are about one hundred and twenty hermitages. The number of chapels, oratories, and shrines, in a space not exceeding ten leagues in diameter, is estimated at nine hundred and thirty. Most of the monasteries were founded and richly endowed by the Greek Emperors. It is worthy of observation that the monasteries of Mount Athos, as well as those in other parts

of the Turkish empire, remained unharmed from the time of Mohammed the 2nd, to recent times, by the Turkish rulers and sovereign, a fact very singularly contrasted with the fate of similar religious establishments in other countries conquered by *Christian* princes.

The monasteries of the Princes Islands formerly were the most flourishing in Turkey. The four habitable islands are situated in a group of small islands, at the entrance of the Gulf of Nicomedia, in the sea of Marmora. These monasteries are now nearly abandoned by all their former monastic inmates, and have become places of pleasure and recreation in the summer months. The empty cloisters of one or two are trodden by a few pale and wretchedly poor monks, some deposed Patriarchs, and disgraced priors, or other subordinates of theirs, flitting through the sombre porches, and gliding along the deserted churches, like the ghosts of the former inmates.

The nearly ruined monasteries of Meteora (seven in number) of Thessaly are situated in the wildest part of Mount Pindus, many of them perched on the peaks of the mountains, on summits of precipitous rocks, the only access to which is by nets attached to ropes and pulleys, by means of which visitors are drawn up, or by ladders fixed to the rock. There are about sixty monks remaining in the ruins of those now dilapidated monasteries. These convents used to be employed for places of punishment, or detention of refractory monks, disgraced dignitaries of the Church, and as reformatories for youths of disorderly lives, the only condition being that the Greek communities should pay an annual sum of £28,000 sterling, which was allotted to the institution charged with the administration of the Greek funds. But this sum did not amount to a tenth part of the actual revenues of the Greek Church in Wallachia alone.

In 1848 the provisional government decreed the emancipation of those tributary monasteries, and appointed a commission to fix the amount of indemnity that ought to be paid to "the holy places," but the labours of this commission were cut short by

the fall of the provisional government, and things then went back to the old state, so that at the present time the total amount of the tribute paid by the principalities to the foreign monasteries may be estimated at £400,000 sterling, nearly a quarter of which amount goes to Mount Athos.

The other famous Greek monastery of Mount Sinai (likewise in Greece) derives a less share of these Moldo-Wallachian funds. This monastery is exceedingly austere. It contains about 100 monks, under a superior, styled archbishop, and head of Mount Sinai. The archbishop is chosen by election but receives by investiture from the Patriarch of Jerusalem.

In 1545, when Belou visited the Holy Mountain of Athos (less than a century after the Conquest), he found 6,000 caloyers or monks in the different monasteries, and of that number he states:—"It would be difficult to find more than two or three in each monastery who can read or write."

This was the state of things in all the monasteries I have visited in the Greek Islands, in European Turkey, in Syria and in Egypt. But amongst the few the very small minority of monks who could read and write in the monasteries I visited, there was generally one monk, sometimes two of the brotherhood, who were addicted to study, were acquainted with the Ancient Greek, had a knowledge of ecclesiastical history, and of the writings of the Greek fathers, and some acquaintance with the principal works or rarest manuscripts of their several libraries. Of the value of those monastic libraries we have abundant evidence in the accounts which the erudite travellers of France and Germany have given of them, and a recent English writer of acknowledged merit, the Hon. Robert Curzon.

Down to the period of the Greek revolution, and its termination in the Hellenic Kingdom, but especially the year 1821, the monasteries were unmolested by the Turks, consequently the library treasures remained uninjured, except by the ignorant members of their own communities. But the successes of the Greeks in the Morea, in 1821, led to irreparable mischief on the monastic libraries of several parts of Greece, and particularly

of the monasteries of Mount Athos at the hands of the infuriated Turks. Vast numbers of rare books, but far more valuable manuscripts, the loss of which never can be retrieved, were destroyed at that period.

Nearly a third of the monks of Mount Athos are annually employed in questing, and on those missions of mendicancy they are frequently absent for considerable periods. The monastic mendicant traveller who returns to his home on the sacred mount, with the best replenished scrip has the best chance at some future time of becoming prior or provisor. But the contributions thus obtained are not the chief means of subsistance of the monasteries. They derive considerable revenue from the fiscalized offerings which the orthodox churches of Greece and Russia annually send to the monastery of the Holy Mountain, and also from a fund raised for what are called "The Dedicated Churches of Wallachia and Moldavia," 28 in number, belonging to Mount Athos.

The total number of those dedicated churches is 102 in all regions, 53 for Wallachia, and 43 for Moldavia. The origin of these foundations is singular. Previously to the power of the Fanariote Greeks being established in Constantinople about the middle of the last century, there was a vast number of monasteries richly endowed, founded chiefly by the Greek Emperor and nobles of Greece.

The monks of Mount Athos in common with all the Greek clergy in Turkey are exempt from the Kharadji tax. But there is a tribute exacted from the monasteries, and collected by the Deflerdar of Karia, having a Mutecellum with twenty soldiers at his orders, who might visit the monasteries officially if the tribute was not paid in due time. But the Holy Mountain of Athos is exempt from the small, profane footprints of female visitors on pilgrimages of any kind. No daughter of Eve of any race or creed is allowed to ascend the sacred mount, or to wander amidst the monasteries of the precincts at its base either "by moonlight alone," or in company, or to come there at any time of day in the society of male pilgrims, lest per-

adventure they might not only inspire a kind of devotion which the good caloyers could not approve of, but profane the sanctity of their little monastic Goshen of orthodox purity, piety, and perfection.

The covetousness of the monasteries of the Greek monks brought on them the covetousness of the Greek Oligarchs of the Fanar. The Fanariotes cancelled the greater number of the original grants, and substituted for them new titles called "Chrysobulls," recognizing a portion of the formerly state-endowed monasteries as dedicated to the Greek communities of the Holy Sepulchre, Mount Sinai and Mount Athos. To these all the other religious foundations in the Turkish provinces were forced to contribute. The Hospodars of Wallachia and Moldavia, and subsequently the national assemblies, frequently protested against this glaring injustice, by which in fact in favour of foreigners living in monasteries in Mount Athos, a fifth of the landed property of the Moldo-Wallachian Territory was alienated. The question has long been a violent as well as protracted controversy. In 1822, when the government of the Danubian provinces was returned to its native princes, a firman was obtained from the Porte, annulling the exorbitant pretensions of the Greek monks, and restoring the surplus ecclesiastical revenues of the principal to their legitimate owners. But the new arrangements made in 1831, when the Greeks were triumphant, were entirely in favour of the Greek Monastic pretensions.

The common grants made to them originally were connected with certain conditions, the employment, especially, of a portion of the funds in pious or charitable uses. In course of time, the conditions were forgotten, the pious and charitable objects fell into abeyance; the appropriation of funds to any other purposes but the uses of the monasteries, had even fallen into desuetude in the life time of some of the pious benefactors and founders of those religious houses. At the period of the power and influence of the Fanariotes, the covetousness or *necessitousness* of the Caloyers had led to an entire appropriation

of the portion of the monastic property that was solely applicable to pious or charitable uses. *The first departure from the rules of all monastic bodies, is attributable to the lust of land and the love of money.* The next departure from the spirit of their institute, and the abandonment of fundamental Christian principles, for sordid appetites for gain, the base grovelling nature of which it becomes the art and whole life aim of a false conscience to conceal, under a mask of zeal for the adornment or aggrandizement of religious houses, churches, and ceremonials, is occasioned by luxury, necessitating a policy of deception and hypocrisy.

One might address to the rulers of the Caloyers of "the Holy Mountain of Athos of those times, the words of Dante in the nineteenth Canto of the Inferno.

"Oh, Simon Magus, say, what led thy brain,
With gold the hallowed *mountain* to profane,
And tempt the wand'ring spouse of God to sin?
Your *sacred calling* claims a harsher lay,
High o'er your frontier hangs the lofty way,
And sees below your horrid lot begin."

* * *

"Then, lo, a later doom the prophet told,
But come seducer of the spouse of God,
Who ruled the Christian *Mount* with iron rod,
Come, thine eternal revenues behold."

* * *

"Say when Jesus grac'd
The humble fisher with the high command,
Did shining gold pollute his holy hand?
Follow my footsteps was his sole request,
Or from his station when Iscariot fell,
Did Peter's choice the chosen saint compel
To buy the empty seat for sums of gold,
Now bid the monarch dread his *sandalled* foe,
Go boast thy treasures to the fiends below,
And have thy wolves destroyed the *mountain* fold."

* * *

Lamented ever be that lib'ral hand
Whose gifts allured the apostolic band,
To leave the humble path where long they trod."*

* Bond's Translation of the Inferno, by Dante. Ed. 1785. Vol. 2, p. 185.

CHAPTER IV.

Proposed Re-union of the Greek and Latin Churches.

In 1850 the Abbé de St. Michou set out from France on an expedition to the East, unauthorised, however, by his spiritual superior, but as he states, animated by a strong desire and predominant impulse to be the means of effecting a union between the Heterodox Catholic Churches of the East, and the Orthodox Church of Rome. An account of this expedition, entitled "A Narrative of a Religious Journey in the East, in 1850 and 1851," was published in London in 1853. It appears that M. the Abbé de St. Michou accompanied a scientific oriental expedition to the East, set on foot by the French Government, at the head of which was a well known savant, M. de Sauley.

The Abbé de St. Michou, an enthusiastic French ecclesiastic, evidently of excellent intentions, but not of very remarkable intellectual powers, in the early part of 1850, seems to have arrived at the conclusion, that "the time was come for an attempt to reconcile the Orthodox Church of the East with the Church of Rome."

"Before setting out (says the author) I wished to ask the benediction upon my labours of the common Father of the Faithful. Since his accession to the Papacy, Pius IX. had entered into a correspondence with the Patriarchs of the Greek

and Armenian Churches. This attempt had failed. I shall explain the reason why the result was so unfortunate. I was convinced that such an important enterprise ought not to be abandoned in consequence of a first failure, the motives of which it would be easy to discover upon the spot.

"I addressed from Paris a memorial to his Holiness, short and comprehensive, in which I stated my thoughts, and the objects of my religious researches. Monseigneur the Nuncio Fornari, who was about to be raised to the dignity of a cardinal, granted me an audience, in which he listened to the details of my plan with the kindest cordiality. He entreated me to devote the journey I had in contemplation to the service of religion, and he promised to present to the Sovereign Pontiff the memorial which I had drawn up.

"'His Holiness, Pius IX.,' said the memorial, 'who more than any one in the Catholic world, has mourned over this isolation, and deplored the sad tendency of an age, which every day departs more and more from the faith, comprehends what happiness it would be for the universal Church, what a triumph for the doctrines of which she is the sacred depository, what glory for a pontificate of which the commencement has given so many hopes, if the reunion of Christian communion were prepared if not completed, by its high initiative.'

"The memorial continued as follows :—

"'These are the facts upon which are founded our hopes of the reunion of Christian communions separated from Rome since the sixteenth century. It therefore follows that an œcumenical council would easily remove the obstacles which have hitherto impeded so important a work, and would tend to accomplish a reconciliation destined to give so much splendour to the Church of Christ.

"'On the other hand, the East, separated for a still longer period, is languishing from day to day, without strength and without life, deprived of the energy which is at once given by authority and unity. The doctrinal points at issue between the two Churches are so easy to clear up, that in them lie the least

obstacles to a reunion. But the old prejudices of religious animosities which amount to fanaticism, and an ignorance of which it is difficult to form an idea, require great judgment in approaching the subject. It will require slow and well-considered preliminaries, not to wound their susceptibilities so long kept up by old antipathies. By wise precautions in carrying forward negociations, the work of the council of Florence may be resumed. It is impossible that the great Eastern churches should be fallen so low that they have not still some Bessarions sufficiently intelligent and upright to recognise the truth, and to co-operate with ardour in the reunion of these two churches.

"'As this reconciliation cannot be made without great caution, and the careful preparation of men's minds, it is desirable that those animated by the sincere wish of saving this noble cause should communicate with eminent men of the estranged communions, to sound them, and to suggest to them the immense advantages of this reunion, so that it is possible to combat revived prejudices, and to weaken antipathies which have their origin only in national pride.'

"I am ignorant whether my humble address, and my prayer of a child of the Church ever reached Pius IX.

"At Constantinople I called upon M. Hillereau, Archbishop of Pera, and Patriarchal vicar of the Latins.

"M. the Patriarchal Vicar received me with extraordinary kindness. In him I found a man of superior mind, who perfectly understood the religious question, and who spoke to me upon it at length, and with remarkable impartiality and great judiciousness. Among the difficulties in the way of bringing together an œcumenical council, M. Hillereau places that of making the Greeks come to it. They would not like to displease the Emperor of Russia, whose co-religionists they are. In case the œcumenical council were convened in any city of the East of Europe, he would convene one in his own dominions, and oppose the Orthodox Greek Church to the Catholic Church, which would render the schism still more violent. He owned, however, that this difficulty ought not to stop the projected

council; that several circumstances might arise and render the opposition of Russia less violent than is commonly supposed.

"I next visited the Abbé Antonio Marinelli, to the house of M. Hassoun, Archbishop and Primate to the Catholic Armenians. M. Hassoun is an Armenian from Constantinople. He is rich from family property, and from the revenues of his office.

"We discussed at length the great question of the œcumenical council. I saw that he fully understood its importance. He told me that he attached immense importance to the council, and that it would be a great blessing to Christianity could this project be realised.

"He had been elected about six or seven years ago, by the Armenian nation, as their spiritual and temporal chief, with the title of Patriarch; but the Propaganda of Rome did not authorize him to take the title officially, although it is always given to him. The Propaganda was perfectly right in this. We must not multiply in the East these titles, which will only create greater difficulties in the case of a union of the non-Catholic part of the Armenian nation.

"It is some time since he resigned his office as temporal chief. The person elected in his place, who takes the title of civil Patriarch, is a simple priest, with no hierarchical station. Commonly the Porte does not allow the temporal chiefs of different nations to be laymen.

"In his desire to advance religion among the Armenian Catholics, M. Hassoun had appointed from his most able priests, six bishops for the most important dioceses of the Catholic Patriarchate, in which, up to this time, there had been only simple vicarial administrators. He had consulted upon this point the Propaganda of Rome, who approved his project, and greatly applauded his zeal; but Rome and the worthy prelate had not foreseen that these bishops would experience from the dioceses to which they were appointed, so insurmountable an opposition, that they have been forced to renounce the thought of establishing themselves there. The Catholic population of

Armenia has contested M. Hassoun's right to impose bishops upon them without consulting them, and without the persons being submitted to their election according to canonical rules. From this it results that the step of the Patriarchal Vicar was a grave mistake; at Rome, where ideas of election receive little favour, the difficulty was not suspected. He is positive that it was not so great as to prevent him from trying to overcome the opposition of the nation and its clergy.

"I went afterwards to call upon the civil Patriarch of the Armenian Catholics. His name is Salvaini. He said there would be no difficulties in the way of a reunion of the Armenian nation, but that obstacles would come from the Greeks. He is persuaded that only an œcumenical council can bring about the reunion. He cited, as a case in point, the failure of the steps taken by Pius IX. at the commencement of his pontificate. His Holiness had sent to court in the month of November, 1847, M. Ferrieri, Archbishop of Sidon *in partibus*, in the quality of apostolical nuncio and visitor general of the East. The nuncio was the bearer of an encyclical letter from the Holy Father, in which he most earnestly entreated the Christians of the East to return to the Roman Church. This noble step of the pious pontiff, was generally attributed to the influence of Father Ventura. The Armenian Patriarch received the nuncio of the Pope in a friendly manner, and politely accepted the encyclical letter; but at his first visit he did not touch upon the great affair. A second visit was to be made, but the Armenian Patriarch refused to see them. The Greek Patriarch received the nuncio with coldness; he took the encyclical letter, and after his departure threw it into the fire, in the presence of bishops and priests. . . .

"*Reply of the Orthodox Eastern Church to the Encyclical Letter of Pope Pius IX,, addressed by His Holiness in January*, 1848, *to the Orthodox Greek Christians.**

* This curious document translated into French, was published in Paris in 1850, by Klincksiech, Rue de Lilie, No. 11. The original document is said to have issued from the Patriarchate Press at Constantinople, under the auspices of the Patriarch, and therefore may be considered an exposition of the Greek Orthodox doctrine.

"The Orthodox Eastern Church, in spite of all the storms which have disturbed her for many centuries, and even do to the present time,—in spite of all the sufferings she has had to undergo, and her struggles against various temptations, still survives. She has undergone vicissitudes, and endured aggressions, but by the visible protection of her invisible Protector, she is kept firmly upon the immovable rock of the faith.

THESIS I.

"The blessed Pope, Pius IX., after having spoken at some length in his encyclical letter to those who have constantly continued in the communion and faith of his see, addresses to all the Orthodox Eastern Christians some words of peace and love (as he says), and of anxiety for those of us who, although we worship Jesus Christ, are yet alienated from the see of St. Peter. He adds that, after the example of Christ, he wishes to bring back the lost sheep into the Lord's fold. Addressing those who discharge the high ecclesiastical functions (not, however mentioning the name of Patriarch), he reminds them of the ancient state of our Churches, when they were closely connected with the other Churches in the world, and asks them what benefit they have found in the dissensions which have arisen up in consequence of this separation, and have brought it to pass that the pastors of the East differ on the subject of doctrine, and sacred authority, not only from the Churches of the West, but also from one another?

REPLY.

"The Eastern Church, its pastors, and all orthodox Christians, return thanks to Pius IX., for his anxiety to bring back the lost sheep into the fold. It is, indeed, a sacred duty incumbent upon his Eminence to recall the thousands who have separated from Rome, and have broken off their union with her. But in the case of the orthodox Eastern Christians, his zeal is entirely

misplaced. For he himself is well acquainted with the ancient union in which the two sisters were, for eight consecutive centuries, connected by the same spirit and by the same profession of faith. Nor is he either ignorant of the grounds—not frivolous but weighty ones (because a Divine truth was then at stake), in consequence of which the Western Church, by persisting in her innovations, broke the sacred bond which united her to the Eastern, while the latter made no alteration in her primitive institutions, neither before nor after the change of her political position—a providential arrangement. She preserves, unaltered, her ancient character; the clergy discharge the duties incumbent upon their respective orders; the holy sacraments are everywhere administered; and in one word, the Eastern Church has firmly kept, and still keeps, unchanged, and in their primitive purity, all the doctrines she has received from the apostles themselves and the holy fathers, who were divinely inspired; she has made no innovation upon these doctrines; she will maintain them for ever, without contention, curtailment, or division, in points of doctrine and pastoral union; although she is undeservedly slandered, and reproached with doing the contrary.

THESIS II.

"Farther on, in his encyclical letter, Pius IX bids the Eastern Christians remember the Creed and the one holy Catholic (universal) and apostolic Church, which they refuse to acknowledge, when they deny that the Roman Church is such.

REPLY.

"The members of the Catholic and orthodox Eastern Church receive and revere the sacred summary of those truths which are contained in sound and pure doctrine. St. Cyril of Jerusalem, in his 18th homily to the catechumens, treating upon the sacred creed, says: "The church is called Catholic, because it extends throughout the universe; and because Catholic

doctrine, in all its points, and with no omissions, is taught within its bosom. The Church, therefore, which contains all truths, with no omissions, and without the least alteration, is one and holy, by reason of the unity and holiness of its only head—our Lord Jesus Christ. The pastors of the primitive apostolical Church under the government of this head, together with the Churches which were lawfully subordinate to them, and with others which remained independent, lived in peaceable union and unanimity. So also by the purity of faith, and by observance of the canons of the apostles and councils, do all the Orthodox Eastern Christians form a well organised body—a holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

THESIS III.

"In the next place to establish the sovereignty of the Bishops of Rome, the usual arguments are advanced in this letter, such as, 1st, The gift of the keys to the Apostle Peter; 2nd, The indefectibility of his faith; 3rd, The command to strengthen his brethren; and 4th, To feed the sheep of Jesus Christ.

REPLY.

"The words addressed by our Lord Jesus Christ, to St. Peter —'Thou art Peter, &c.,' were equally so to the other apostles. 'Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven' (Matt. xviii. 18). The words, 'On this rock will I build my Church,' were equally said of all the apostles, and even of the prophets. 'Built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets' (Ephes. ii. 20). 'And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve apostles of the Lamb' (Rev. xxi. 14). Now the words just quoted lead us to the conclusion that Jesus Christ alone is the chief stone in the foundation of the apostles, and of the whole Church. 'Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone' (Ephes. ii. 20). It is true that it was to St. Peter that the

Lord said: 'Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church' (Matt. xvi. 18); but it was only because St. Peter anticipated the other apostles in this confession: 'Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God." As to the sense of the words, 'And upon this rock I will build my Church,' St. Augustine (besides the Eastern fathers) explains them as follows:—'Thou art Peter,' says Christ, 'and upon this rock that thou hast confessed, upon this rock that thou hast acknowledged, by saying, "Thou art the Christ, the son of the living God," I will build my Church; it is not upon thine own self, but indeed upon me that thou mayest build the Church, which is my body.' But those who wished to lay their foundation upon men said, 'As for me, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos and I of Cephas' (1 Cor. i. 12). Now the exposition of the blessed Western father shows us, in the first place, that the rock upon which the Church was founded is not the Apostle Peter, but the Apostle's confession of faith—Jesus Christ himself. 'That rock was Christ' (1 Cor. x. 4); in the second place, that those who persist in saying: 'I am of Cephas (of Peter); it is Peter that I respect exclusively, and acknowledge as the head of all the holy fathers, and of the Church herself,'—those men, in the words of St. Paul and of St. Augustine, divide Christ, and build upon a human foundation.

"As to the special prayer of Christ for Peter, that his faith might no more fail; 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren' (Luke xxii. 32), the fathers gave very clear explanations upon this point; as Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Epiphanius, Macarius, Ægyptus, Titus, of Bostra, Theophylact, and Cyril, of Alexandria. Jesus Christ, in his wonderful prayer to his heavenly Father, which we read in the seventeenth chapter of St. John, prayed generally for all the apostles, and for those that should believe on him through their word. If then he prayed for Peter especially, it was because he foresaw that even he who uttered these presumptuous words: 'Though all

men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended' (Matt. xxvi. 33), would deny his master, and thus deeply fall. But after this, having too much confidence in his own strength, and after having broken the promise he had made, fear took hold of him, and he was guilty of denying his master. Christ prayed, not that the faith of Peter might not waver (for this had already come to pass, as a punishment for his presumptuous words), but that it might not entirely fail and die, so far as to reduce him to despair in consequence of his denial; and that Peter, having washed away his sin by repentance, and been converted to his former faith, might become a salutary example of restoration for all other brethren whose faith might waver.

"Immediately after the above words were uttered by the Lord, not to show the supremacy of St. Peter, but to preserve him from the despair which the enormous sin he had committed might reduce him (a truth which is well set forth by the fathers, and is self-evident), the encyclical letter, to justify the power that the Bishops of Rome have arrogated to themselves, advanced the ordinary arguments, in a well-known order, which the Eastern Church has centuries ago triumphantly refuted in writing.

THESIS IV.

"Jesus Christ expressly charged St. Peter to feed his lambs and sheep; he therefore entrusted to his care the whole Church, which consists of true lambs and sheep of Jesus Christ, and this care now devolves upon the sovereign pontiffs of Rome, &c.

REPLY.

"To explain this point, we think it will be enough to say as follows:—The threefold question, addressed by our Lord to St. Peter, is a command rather than anything else; for this reason no allusion is made to any power, but to a sacred duty, strictly laid upon all the Lord's ministers. 'Feed the flock of God

which is among you ' (1 Peter v. 2). Let those who pretend that in this command given to St. Peter, there is a reference to some mysterious prerogative, consult the works of the holy fathers, Augustine, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, and Cyril, of Alexandria; they will then see what meaning the fathers put on these words.

" For the sake of brevity we will cite here only the words of the first-mentioned of these fathers. St. Augustine says, by the thrice-repeated confession of St. Peter: ' Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee,' the sin of the threefold denial is blotted out, and the apostolate of St. Peter is restored; this was done to remove the idea that might be entertained that the apostolate would be weakened by the denial into which Peter fell from the frailty of human nature. With this explanation before our eyes, we must read the sacred words of the gospel in the sense of the old fathers of the Church. Jesus says to Simon Peter: ' Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these?' that is, Do you who formerly boasted and said—' Though all men shall be offended because of thee, yet will I never be offended,'—do you, I say, love me more than the other apostles? Peter, properly taught by painful experience, no longer dares tell Jesus that he loves him more than the other apostles, but he says in reply only: ' Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee.' Jesus Christ having received this humble answer, does not keep on requiring more love from Peter than from the rest—a thing which Peter had formerly boasted of—but simply asks him of love. ' Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me?' To this Peter humbly gave the same answer; but having been questioned the third time, Peter remembered his threefold denial, and was, not without reason, grieved. ' Peter was grieved because he said unto him the third time, " Lovest thou me " ' (John xxi. 17). It follows, consequently, that St. Peter saw in this triple interrogation, not any prerogative, but rather a humiliation, remorse for his denial being in his mind.

" In like manner the threefold command of our Lord to St. Peter: ' Feed my lambs and my sheep,' is not a summary

charge to rule the Church, nor any other extraordinary commission, as the supporters of Rome take it to be, by explaining this saying in a very arbitrary manner. To bring out the truth more clearly, we will quote the testimony of the Western fathers, and in the first place, that of St. Ambrose. 'The Apostle Peter,' he says, 'after his fall, which proceeded from the weakness of human nature, was thrice questioned, because of his threefold denial. The first question, 'Lovest thou me?' is an allusion to his love before the cross; the second, to his love for the flock; and the third is the expression of the pardon of his sin (De Sac. lib. ii. c. 7).' In the second place, we shall cite the following passage of St. Augustine: 'Thrice fear denied, thrice love confessed.' Would you know the meaning of the Lord's command, 'Feed my sheep?' know then that to feed is to teach and nourish with spiritual food (Homil. V. in Evang. Joh.) Such, then, is the explanation of the fathers, such the interpretation of this passage which is given by the primitive Catholic and Orthodox Church.

"A passage of St. Irenæus (Contra. Hær. lib. iii. c. 4.) is afterwards quoted in the encyclical letter, and arbitrarily mutilated.

THESIS V.

"St. Irenæus, in appealing to the doctrine of the Apostles against the heretics of his age, considers that it is useless to enumerate the traditions of all the churches which have an apostolic origin, but asserts that it is enough to cite against them the doctrine of the Roman Church, and says the whole Church, that is, all the faithful in the whole world, must rally round the Church of Rome on account of the pre-eminence of this Church, in which the traditions received from the Apostles have been preserved on all matters believed by the faithful.

REPLY.

"The words of St. Irenæus against the Gnostic heretics, in their original and unaltered text, are as follows: 'As it would

be too long (but not useless as the Pope has it) to enumerate the traditions of all the churches, we shall silence any one who carries his speculations beyond due bounds, no otherwise than by considering the tradition of the Apostles and the faith preached to men; and come down to our days, as it has been preserved in the great, ancient, and well-known Church, established at Rome by the two illustrious Apostles, Peter and Paul (not by Peter only). With this Church, on account of its very firm foundation, the whole Church must agree, that is to say, the faithful in all the world, for there has ever been preserved, down to my time, the traditions of the Apostles.'

"In what a pitiful manner have the words of the holy father been mutilated! The words—'the whole Church must agree,' (the mutilators leaving out the context) have been transformed into the following—'the faithful must rally round the Church of Rome on account of its pre-eminence.' This pre-eminence was not then invented, and the blessed Irenæus knew nothing about it. Having to argue with the Gnostics, he addressed the Churches of the West subordinated to Rome, and combatting these heretics with the ancient tradition, that is to say, with the tradition given to all the Churches by the Apostles. St. Irenæus passes by in silence other Churches on account of their great number, and refers only to the Church of Rome, in the patriarchate of which he was a bishop. There was then no other sovereign city. The Church of ancient Rome had the primacy of honor over the Western Churches subordinated to her, and on this account is mentioned by Irenæus. Further, the holy father cites in the same chapter not only the Church of Rome, but also those of Ephesus and Smyrna. Had he acknowledged the supreme authority of the Bishop of Rome only, he would, in his controversy with the Gnostics, have cited only this Church, without mentioning any other. But he acknowledged the other churches as equals of Rome, and as of the same authority; for this reason he, together with the neighbouring bishops, induced Pope Victor not to excommunicate the Christians of Asia, and, at the same time, rebuked him for

having done so on account of a difference in the celebration of Easter, and not to make a schism in the churches on such an unimportant difference.

"At the time when the two Churches of the East and the West were united together, as much by purity of doctrine as by Christian love and union; at this time, we say, the bishops of the Eastern Church, more than once, when unjust attacks were made upon them, solicited help from the pious Bishops of Rome, whom they looked upon as primates, in respect of their see and precedence. However, after the schism of the two Churches, the Bishops of Rome, with undue presumption, and no longer content with the *primacy* of their position, presumed to arrogate *supremacy* over the whole Church. On this account, in page 9 of the encyclical letter, directly after the passage of St. Irenæus just cited, it is set forth as a very important argument for the supremacy of the Bishops of Rome, that the Eastern Bishops have solicited help at their hands; and, first of all, Athanasius the Great, of whom it is said:"

THESIS VI.

"Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, when he was unjustly condemned and driven from his see, came to Rome. Now Julius, Bishop of Rome, took cognizance of each man's case (for other bishops, unjustly driven by the Arians from their sees, likewise came to Rome), and having found them all faithful to the Nicene Creed, because they thought the same as he did, he admitted them to communion. And as by reason of the pre-eminence of the Holy See, the care of all is incumbent upon him, he restored them to their Churches, &c."

REPLY.

"Athanasius the Great, who suffered so much for religion, after he had been calumniated and condemned by the Arian

bishops, headed by his sworn enemy, Eusebius of Nicomedia, repaired to Rome to Constantine, Emperor of the West, and to Pope Julius, for he knew that the Roman Church was opposed to the Arians, and preserved in its integrity the Creed of Nicæa. And did Julius, when he pleaded the cause of Athanasius, who was unjustly condemned, express himself to the orthodox and Arians as their head in terms like these:—'This is the will of the Church of Rome, by reason of the keys of St. Peter,' or in other terms equally presumptuous? on the contrary, he wrote to them modestly, and showed himself mindful of the union between the Churches. To prove the unlawful consecration of Gregory as the successor of Athanasius, he does not say that the sanction of the Pope ought, first of all to have been asked, and only after that ought Athanasius to be deprived and Gregory to be ordained, but he simply says that the Eastern Church would have done well to have conferred with the Western on this matter, that all might have together decided what was required by justice, seeing that those who were unjustly dealt with were bishops of churches which had been founded by the apostles in person. Pope Julius, moreover, says in respect of this letter to the Eastern Church, that he wrote it in pursuance of a decision of a council held at Rome. 'For,' he says, 'although I alone have signed the letter, the opinion is not mine alone, but that also of the other bishops of Italy and the neighbouring countries.' And as in this letter Julius considers not himself but the council as the judge, no conclusion in favour of ecclesiastical supremacy can be deduced therefrom, nor as to the right of supreme jurisdiction. (Athanas. Apol. 2, Socrates, and others.) In one word, it was not the Bishop of Rome that restored Athanasius to his see, and permitted him to return to Alexandria, but Constantine, through the entreaties and even threats on the part of Constance. (Socrates, lib. 2.)

"After this, the encyclical letter says as follows of St. Chrysostom:

THESIS VII.

"John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, who was wrongfully condemned by the council of Chalcedon, had recourse to the Apostolic See by letters and envoys, and was acquitted, our predecessor Innocent I. having proved his innocence.

REPLY.

"St. John Chrysostom, that man of God, having been deprived of his see by the council which was convoked by wicked men, at a villa near Chalcedon, called The Oak, wrote concerning these unjust attacks against him (but he never sent legates), not only to Pope Innocent, but also to other bishops, such as Flavian of Antioch, John of Jerusalem, Eulogius of Antioch, Theodosius of Scythopolis, to the bishops of Macedonia, and last of all to Aurelius, Bishop of Carthage in Africa. (Sozomen, lib. 8, c. 24. Chrysostom's Letters, 37, 91, 95.) Innocent, who was solicited by Chrysostom to convene an œcumenical council to inquire into the calumnies of which he was the victim and to pronounce judgment after inquiry, did all he could to convoke an œcumenical council; but all his efforts notwithstanding the concurrence of Honorius, Emperor of the West, had no result. The envoys whom the Pope sent to Byzantium, became embroiled with some members of the court of Arcadius and Eudoxia, and were sent back in disgrace, as though they had come only to trouble a foreign government. St. Chrysostom they succeeded in banishing to a greater distance, viz., to Pityus, in Colchis. (Letter 2 of Chrys. to Innocent. Sozom., lib. 6, last chapter.) This is the true account, founded upon and attested by good evidence; it will be seen that it differs greatly from the Roman version of the matter, which has been taken from false histories, and altered facts. This account shows us then that the holy father

wrote about what had happened to him not only to the Bishop of Rome, but also to other bishops, and that both Chrysostom and Innocent (and nothing can be clearer than this) acknowledge the supreme authority of the œcumenical council which they endeavoured to convoke.

"In order to establish more fully the absolute supremacy of the Bishop of Rome, from their primacy in question, the encyclical letter, by way of supplement to what has been before said in it, puts forth the following:

THESIS VIII.

"Another example of the respect of your fathers for the supremacy of the Bishops of Rome, is met with in the council of Chalcedon (451). The bishops assembled there, about six hundred in number, who, with some few exceptions, belonged to the East; after the letters (read the letter) from Leo the Great, Sovereign Pontiff of Rome, had been read, cried out in the second act of the council: 'It is St. Peter has thus spoken by the mouth of Leo,' &c.

REPLY.

"The letter of Pope Leo to the fourth œcumenical council which was convened at Chalcedon, though quite orthodox, had notwithstanding to undergo a mature examination, whether it were or were not in conformity with the creed of the first and second œcumenical councils, and also with the profession of faith made by St. Cyril at the third œcumenical council, as is shown by the acts of the above-mentioned fourth council. After the deliberations upon the letter were finished, Anatolius of Constantinople having been asked whether it were orthodox and in agreement with the decrees of the œcumenical councils, replied that it fully agreed both with the creeds of the 318 and 150 fathers, and with that decreed upon by St. Cyril at the council of Ephesus. So you see that it was not from Leo's

letter, which the father had examined, that judgment was pronounced upon the heresy of Eutyches, and an end put to the troubles which it had called forth, but from the decrees of the councils of Nicæa, Constantinople, and Ephesus. Now which is superior, he who is examined and judged, or he who examines and judges? Leo, although an orthodox and holy man, said nothing in his letter to the council concerning his headship, but only set forth in his profession of faith what the fathers had already said in the preceding councils. It is therefore utterly impossible to deduce from it any conclusion in favour of the absolute supremacy, as the Romans imagine can be done, when they fall back upon the letter of St. Leo to the fourth council. If this letter has been called the pillar of orthodoxy, the letters of the eastern bishops to their Patriarch, Tarasius, were equally called by the fathers at the seventh œcumenical council, "the pillar of piety,' as the letter of Tarasius to the eastern bishops was called 'the rule of orthodoxy.' Now the pillar of orthodoxy, the pillar of piety, and the rule of orthodoxy, are one and the same thing.

When the fathers at the fourth council requested that the letter from St. Cyril of Alexandria might be read, and the letter had been read, the council exclaimed: 'So does St. Cyril believe so do we believe; may the memory of St. Cyril live for ever!' Then, when St. Leo's letter had also been read, the fathers exclaimed again: 'This is the faith of the fathers of the church; it is that of the Apostles. So Peter hath spoken by the mouth of Leo.' Thereupon they added: 'Thus did the Apostles teach.' All this proves plainly, that the fathers acknowledged Leo as orthodox, on account of the perfect agreement between his creed and the doctrine of Cyril. Now Cyril's letter having given no supremacy to Cyril, neither did Leo's letter give any to Leo.

THESIS IX.

"The Bishops of Rome obtained the first rank in the councils, and especially in the œcumenical councils, and their authority

was appealed to, both before and after the institution of councils. We might, independently of councils, cite several other acts and writings of the fathers and ancient eastern writers, which prove that the supremacy of the Bishops of Rome was firmly established in the East in the time of your ancestors, &c. (page 10).

REPLY.

"In the first place, not one of the seven œcumenical councils was convened by the pretended power of the sovereign pontiffs of Rome, to which (as Catholics say) recourse would have been had either before or after the convocation of the councils; but, as is shown both by the acts and history of the councils, these sacred assemblies were convened expressly and particularly by the supreme authority and absolute power of the orthodox emperors of the East, who summoned the bishops both of the East and West to take part in the councils, either in person, or by their representatives. To prove that the consent of the Pope was never required before convening the œcumenical councils, and that the legates of the Bishops of Rome did not attend the council as invested with supreme power, but did so with submission, we think the following facts will suffice. The legates whom Pope Agatho sent to the sixth œcumenical council said to the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus: 'Sire: in pursuance of the order issued by your Majesty to our very Holy Pope, we are sent to you, under the protection of God, as the bearers of a communication from His Holiness.' This communication was in these terms:—'In consequence of a pious order of your clemency, under the protection of God, out of obedience to which we are bound, and not from boldness, we send you our fellow-labourers; and kneeling in spirit before you, we humbly entreat your clemency to honour them with a gracious welcome.' (First Act of the 6th Council.) Pope Adrian, when he sent his legates to the seventh œcumenical council, wrote as follows to the Emperor Constantine and to Irene:—'Most pious and benignant sovereigns, it is with very cordial love that I entreat

your kindness, and as though I did so in person, kneeling before you, and falling at your feet, I beseech, exhort, and conjure you, in the presence of God, to restore the holy images, and to let them be worshipped according to the ancient rule, in the capital and in both parts of Greece. (Act 2 of the 7th Council.)

As to the supremacy which has caused so much noise and discussion, to which the Bishop of Rome makes such great pretensions, which he so far elevates and exalts as to threaten those who dispute it, we may truly say that it cannot be proved from the works of the Eastern fathers, and that the Eastern Church has never acknowledged it, notwithstanding what the Bishops of Rome say on the point. According to the conclusive canons of the seven œcumenical councils, held before the schism of the churches, the Eastern Church, its chief bishop, and its four orthodox patriarchs, awarded nothing to the Bishops of Rome, excepting the primacy of honour, but connected therewith no idea of primacy or sovereignty over the whole Christian Church.

"The sixth canon of the first œcumenical council says as follows:—'Let the ancient customs received in Egypt, Lybia, and at Pantapolis, be maintained, according to which the Bishop of Alexandria has authority over all the bishops of these countries The Bishop of Rome has a similar prerogative. The prerogatives conferred upon churches of Antioch, as well as of other places, are likewise to be maintained.'

"The canon we have just cited shows us very plainly the authority of the Bishop of Rome was, in all respects, equal to that of the Bishops of Alexandria, Antioch, and other sees. From this it is clear that the first œcumenical council was far from acknowledging, in the Bishop of Rome, the power of absolute supremacy over the universal church, or, what comes to the same thing, the dignity of the head of the church.

The third canon of the second œcumenical council prescribes —"Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the primacy of honour, after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople is New Rome. Admitting that, it might be asked whether the Bishop of Rome has simply the primacy of honour, and no

supreme and universal authority. We must, then, be very attentive to the meaning of the canon of the council according to which the Bishop of Constantinople follows immediately after the Bishop of Rome. The cause is, that Constantinople is New Rome. Why, then, does the Bishop of Rome take precedence over the Bishop of Constantinople? Because he is Bishop of ancient Rome. From this it may, therefore, be concluded, that the second council awarded to the Bishop of Rome the prerogative of antiquity, and not an exclusive power.

"After having established the ancient rights and independence of the Bishops of Cyprus and of other bishops, which had been violated, and limited the power of each to their respective episcopates, giving them no right to extend it beyond those limits, the third œcumenical council, to prevent similar abuses in future, decreed as follows :—'Let not the order of the fathers be infringed upon; let not the arrogance of temporal power creep in by stealth, under pretence of sacred acts, so far as to deprive us, little by little, without our perceiving it, of the liberty that the liberator of all men, our Lord Jesus Christ, has mercifully given us, at the cost of his blood. (Can. viii.)

The sacred council, therefore, instead of approving or admitting the absolute authority of bishops (such as Roman Church attributes to the Pope,) on the contrary, expressly rejected it. Nor did the council fail to take great care that a like arrogance of authority should not, in time, show itself among the pastors of the church.

The twenty-eighth canon of the fourth œcumenical council says: "Observing in all things the decrees of the holy fathers, and acknowledging the canon of the 550 pious bishops which has just been read (the third in the second council), we appoint and accord the same privileges to the most holy Church of Constantinople, the new Rome. For the fathers with reason, accorded to the see of ancient Rome the privileges that she enjoys, because it was the seat of government. For the same reason the 550 bishops of the second general council determined that New Rome, which has the honour of being the seat of empire and

the senate, should have the same advantages in the order of the Church, and be the second to it. (Labbé, tom. iv. p. 769).

"According to the decree of this council, we must equally pay attention, in the first place to the fact that the sacred council, although awarding certain prerogatives to the Bishop of Rome, solely on account of the importance of this city, does not acknowledge in him, however, the extraordinary power of which this bishop presumptuously boasts in our times; in the second place, that the second as well as the third œcumenical council accorded to the see of New Rome the same prerogatives as to the ancient see. Hence it follows, that if the Bishop of Rome obtained precedency and the primacy of honour over the Bishop of Constantinople, it was only because it would be impossible for these two bishops each to be first at the same time, not because the Bishop of Rome had any prerogative of authority, or of particular and exclusive power, in respect to the Universal Church. The Bishop of Constantinople, therefore, exercised the same power in New Rome, as the Bishop of Rome in the ancient city. The same thing must be said of the three other Patriarchs of the Eastern Church, who, when they were together at councils, and in some other cases, always gave to the Bishops of Rome and of Constantinople, the primacy of position and of precedence, but of nothing else.

"Having republished what had been already ordered and decreed by the foregoing councils, concerning the sees of the Patriarch, the sixth œcumenical council adds, in its thirty-sixth canon:—'in republishing what was ordained by the 550 fathers assembled in this seat of government, which has been preserved by God, as well as by the 630 fathers assembled at Chalcedon, we decree that the see of Constantinople has the same prerogative as the see of ancient Rome; and that, as it is the second see, it takes the lead, like the former, in ecclesiastical matters; and that after it, in the following order, come, the see of the great city of Alexandria, that of Antioch, and lastly that of Jerusalem.

"In compliance with this decree of the council, the Bishop of Constantinople, as is the Eastern custom, is called Patriarch; and the Bishop of Rome, according to the custom of the Western Church, is called Pope; as the Bishop of Alexandria, according to ancient custom, is also called Pope.

"Let any man who wishes to be impartial, fall back upon the decisive arguments we have just set forth, which have been taken from the œcumenical councils, at which were present, or took part, either by word of mouth or by consent, the blessed Popes of that time, and himself judge how far it is from the truth that the pretended supremacy would have had any force in the East, with our holy fathers, or, which comes to the same thing, in these œcumenical councils. But Rome has formed a habit, which is a favourite and common one with her, of understanding things in an unusual way, and according to her own will of interpreting things falsely, and altering their sense.

"A like primacy—either as a head of the Church, as an absolute authority, or as a centre of true faith—was, therefore, never known or acknowledged in the person of a bishop by the Christian Church, considering that the bishops of the primitive Church are known to have had always in mind the words of the Lord: 'Whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant' (Matt. xx. 26, 27). And as every bishop in obedience to this divine commandment, acknowledged himself as the servant of his brethren, no one, during the lifetime of the apostles and the apostolic fathers, ever dreamt of primacy or supremacy over the others. Moreover, the Churches of the most illustrious cities of that time, in which were a greater number of believers, and especially the bishops of the Churches whose succession was traced back to the apostles, acquired over other neighbouring but less famous Churches such prerogatives as made them a kind of refuge for them. Of this kind were the Churches of Antioch, the bishops of which were ordained by the Apostles Peter and Paul; of Alexandria, founded by the

Evangelist Mark; and of Rome, founded by the Apostles Peter and Paul together. Then the order of the œcumenical councils required one of the three bishops of the illustrious Churches we have just mentioned to have the primacy of honour, and that precedence should be granted to him. On this account, in accordance with the canon of the council, the fathers did not err in granting the primacy to the see of ancient Rome as the seat of government. We, holding steadfastly to the words of the canon, of the fourth œcumenical council just quoted: 'The fathers have given the primacy,' do not hesitate to add as an indisputable conclusion, that these prerogatives were given to the Bishops of Rome neither by the Apostles, nor by the Lord himself. And since the body of Roman bishops can nowise be acknowledged as the Church of Christ, that Church cannot either accept them as its head; for, from the words of Holy Writ, and according to the expression of St. Paul, no one, besides Jesus Christ can be chief and head of the Church (Ephes. iv. 8—15).

"And as the Romans, to prove the supremacy of the Popes, bring forward the epistle of St. Clement to the Corinthians—we must say that this proves nothing. For in ancient times, as we have already said, the Churches with the fewest believers, applied in matters of faith and controversy, and in dissensions, to the bishops of the most illustrious cities. Now of this kind was the Church of Rome, not, however, by virtue of the right which its bishops arrogate to pronounce a final decision upon the affairs of the whole Christian Church—a right, which being only of recent invention, was not known in the Church of the second century.

"St. Clement, of Rome, addressed to Corinth an admonition which tended to put an end to the evil, and to lead the Corinthians to live in peace and unanimity. Dionysius, the famous bishop of Corinth, under Antoninus Verus, a holy man, a disciple of the apostolical fathers, distinguished for his erudition and untiring activity,—he also, not to mention several other bishops, wrote to several churches, and thus made him-

self most useful to foreign churches. His instructions and epistles were resplendent with great erudition; and excited in many Churches a desire to ask him for other epistles, as he supplied not milk, but strong meat. In the primitive times of the Christian Church, therefore, divinely inspired men did not address epistles of this kind to the Churches from ambition, but in obedience to the words of the divine apostle, for the edification and perfection of the Lord's flock scattered abroad. (Ephes. iv. 12.)

THESIS X.

"We, children of the Eastern Church, thank His Holiness for his earnest invitations to us to be converted without delay, and unite ourselves to his see, which he believes to be the true foundation of the real Christian Church.

REPLY.

"In the first place, we assert that the Christian Church, from its institution, has never acknowledged nor does acknowledge at present (as we have sufficiently shown above), St. Peter, nor any man as the foundation. It acknowledges Jesus Christ as the first stone of the foundation. 'For other foundation can no man lay than that which is Jesus Christ.'—(1 Cor. iii. 11).

"In the second place, the encyclical letter says that the Easterns voluntarily separated themselves from the firm rock on which the Church of Rome has been built: that is to say, that the Church of the East has separated herself from that of the West.

"But for this to be said with justice and truth, proofs ought to have been given, that the Church of Rome, after the schism of the Churches, has remained as pure as at its origin, and that the Eastern Church has infringed upon some important and unchangeable law of the one holy Catholic Church. But as

nothing has been said upon this point we pass on. In considering both Churches at the time of their union, or rather, in considering the Catholic (universal) Church, in the first eight centuries, we find that to preserve its unity and integrity precisely and surely, she referred to a sacred law the following rule:—In general, orthodoxy in faith, and in the canonical institution of the Catholic (universal) Church is attested by the word of God, by means of the general consent of the Church and the fathers; as to particular Churches, they can themselves arrange their special matters, regarding only ecclesiastical discipline elsewhere; but they must not be bold, otherwise the basis of Christianity would be shaken. Upon this sacred law were the œcumenical councils immovably based, which would not even have been convened had such a law had no existence.

"Let us now, then, go through all the eight centuries of the one holy Catholic Church, till the schism of the two Churches took place, and let us look whether the sacred law of the Catholic (universal) Church, of which we have just spoken, is still preserved; if so, in which of the two Churches which are no longer united together, this law possesses all its force.

"On attentively looking at the Church of Rome, we see there in the foreground a new creed put forth by the council which was convened at Trent, in Germany, in 1545, under Pope Paul III.; a creed which not only departs from the faith it professes, but which is opposed, in almost every point to the profession of the ancient Catholic (universal) Church, and to the sacred creed of the two first œcumenical councils of Nicæa and Constantinople. After the unjustifiable addition ('filioque') to an ancient divine doctrine which the Tridentine creed has made, in spite of the positive words of the Gospel, which were uttered by Jesus Christ, who is God, there follow in this creed much new and unjustifiable doctrine; such strange ordinances as cannot even be traced in the ancient creed which deserves all our respect, but which are the work of a rash passion for innovation. The following are the innovations:—1. I acknowledge the true sacrament by which Jesus Christ is wholly received in

one kind. 2. I believe in the power of indulgences to remit sin, a power bestowed upon the Church by Jesus Christ, and I acknowledge that they have a wholesome use for mankind. 3. I promise absolute submission to the Pontiff of Rome, successor of St. Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ; and this I swear, so help me God!

"Such are the innovations—such are the new articles of faith,—which, though opposed to the ancient creed, the Westerns have arbitrarily established, but which they, however, pretend were framed by an œcumenical council, as they falsely call that of Trent; for they forgot, that from the time when Christians were divided into two distinct parties, there is no such thing as an œcumenical council; and no council can be called so which is not called together with the unanimous consent of the whole Church; it follows *à fortiori*, that Trent was not such a council even of the Western Church, because it was then troubled and shaken by a violent storm—Luther having upset and rent it. The Eastern Church, having seen the Western adopt such innovations, and, if we may be allowed to say so, depart from the ancient and sacred creed of the Orthodox faith, and from the doctrines set forth in the Word of God —doctrines that the Western Church had herself, together with the Eastern, reverenced and professed without the least alteration for upwards of eight centuries—the Eastern Church, we repeat, with its bishops and all the orthodox, were in suspense in the presence of such facts; she was surprised that the blessed Pope, at a period of general disorder, should have determined to enter upon a matter of this kind—to bring back to communion with his see the Eastern Church, which from its origin to the present time, believes and celebrates the holy sacraments with unchangeable agreement and unanimity, which keeps the pure and sacred doctrines of divine faith, as she has received them, unchanged, untouched, unvarying, ever the same, and with no innovation. How could the Holy Father propose to a nation which was the first Pagan people to embrace Christianity—to abandon the traditions of the fathers,—which was

first named after the name of Christ; which suffered so much for her holy religion before the taking of Constantinople (as history, ever impartial, tells us), and which has had afterwards so much to undergo from Rome and her missionaries, who were sent, as was said, to propagate religion. These missionaries used all their efforts to unsettle the faith of this nation—its sacred heritage from the holy fathers; fallacies, false teaching, insinuating conversations, pamphlets, and even calumnies as at the present time, wrongs and expedients of every kind,—everything has been tried, and nothing has succeeded. The Westerns have tried in vain; the nation of which we speak, in spite of all its vicissitudes, has remained firm in its belief; it has not overstepped the limits prescribed by the holy fathers: it has not submitted to any senseless addition to its holy doctrine; on the contrary, it has preserved, firmly and unchangeably, the doctrine and tradition of the Apostles, conformably to the canons and decrees made and issued under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, by the fathers of the East and West, at the seven œcumenical councils.

"The Eastern Church, by her bishops and all the orthodox, has already sufficiently explained herself, when she was invited to abandon the holy creed, separate herself from the sacred doctrine, and adopt the doctrines of Rome, the innovations of Trent, which are opposed to the sacred creed, and which have separated the Western Church not only from the Eastern, but also from the Orthodox Church of ancient Rome. In fine, an enormous chasm has been put between the two Churches—between the Eastern Church and her sister in times past, the Western Church; and it will remain as long as the innovations of the Church of Rome are unhealed, and especially on this addition ('filioque'), which is the worst of all:—as long, in fact, as that Church, by persisting in her innovations, remains irreconcileable to the Orthodox Church.

"At the end of his reply, the Eastern Church implores our God and Lord Jesus Christ—her chief, and the rock of her faith—to heal the wounds inflicted on the Church of Rome by

the evil spirit of dominion, to strengthen the enfeebled members of his body, the Church, and to re-animate those who are on the point of falling away, on account of cruel sufferings. Relying upon the divine power of Jesus Christ, the Orthodox Church is deeply convinced that out of his infinite mercy to the frailty of man, our Lord will work a miracle before all the world, by effecting a sound cure of the wounds with which the Church of Rome is afflicted, by giving life to her instead of death, union instead of dissension, one-sided discussions, reproaches and slanders; and finally, a perfect acquaintance with, and adoption of, the idea that the Holy Spirit had a personal existence from all eternity, from the Father.

"We cannot pass by in silence the circumstance that the Romans, when they bring arguments from the holy fathers, often confound the idea of the eternal procession of the Holy Spirit with the idea of His temporal mission, that is, with the supernatural gifts of the Holy Spirit which emanated from the Father, and were distributed through the Son. Two different ideas are expressed by the two Greek words, *οὐσία* and *ὑπόστασις*, which the ancient Latin fathers expressed by a single word—*substantia*. By this means the divines of the middle ages and of modern times confound two different ideas, and understand the substance (*ὑπόστασις*) where the essence is referred to (*οὐσία*) and understood essence (*οὐσία*), where the substance (*ὑπόστασις*) is in question. The Eastern Church believes and confesses that the Holy Spirit has the same essence (*οὐσία*) with the Father and the Son; but says that, personally and hypostatically, (*ὑποστατικῶς*) does not proceed from the Father and the Son, and rejects this innovation as an unfounded and blasphemous doctrine. Thus, the Westerns, by not clearly distinguishing between substance and essence (*ὑπόστασις καὶ οὐσία*), depart from theological truth. Here is their whole difference; this produces their schism and disagreement with the Eastern Church.

"May our God and Father—the eternal source of the peace of the world, and of unanimity among men—reconcile the two

Churches (provided that the Romans, after mature deliberation, will reject what they imprudently adopted in spite of the universal Church); and may these Churches which of old were sisters, but are now divided by dissensions, be re-united together by the Holy Spirit, proceeding, in accordance with its external existence, from the Father only! Amen. Amen."

There are abundant evidences in the preceding answers of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople to the overtures of Pius IX., with a view to the reunion of the Latin and Greek Churches, of unscrupulousness in dealing with ecclesiastical history, the writings of the fathers, and the records of councils. Still the document is valuable, as embodying the objections of the highest authorities of the Greek Church to union with the Latin one. Moreover, to me it has always seemed that too much light can never be thrown on subjects gravely affecting religious interests, and that the policy of shrouding those in darkness which seem to us objectionable, is generally only successful for a short time. I have no doubt, if I were able to lay before my readers a reply of the authorities of the Latin Church to the manifesto of the Greek Patriarch above cited, many of the most specious statements in it would be disposed of pretty much in the same way as St. Cyprian disposed of similar statements put forth by Greek ecclesiastics in his day:—

"These are the beginnings and original causes of mischievous schisms and heresies; first, a desire of the authors of them to please and elevate themselves; secondly, being puffed up with pride, to contemn their rulers and superiors. Thus they are led to abandon and forsake their Church, to erect a new altar outside of it, and against it, and finally they violate altogether peace and unity in Christ, and rebel against God's ordinance."*

* Cyp. Ep. 65, ad Rogation.

CHAPTER V.

The Armenian Community.

THE origin of this people is traced to the most remote antiquity. The regions to which is assigned the cradle of the human race, the Mount Ararat, of universal interest and veneration, including territory of some 420 geographical miles in breadth, by 900 in length, watered by four great rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, the Araxes, and the Phasis, comprising the Great and Little Armenia, are now, to a considerable extent included in the Russian dominions. Mount Ararat, rising from the region between the Euxine and the Caspian, the great place of veneration of the Armenians, now owns for its lord and master the Czar of Russia.

Armenia claims the derivation of its name from Aram, sixth successor of Haig, contemporary of Ninus. Strabo derives it from Armenus, one of the Aronauts.

The Armenians assert their origin from Haig, a great grandson of Japhet, who, according to their writers, fled from Babylon twenty-two centuries before Christ. The descendants of Haig they call Haighasdan.

Armenia, for many centuries, before it was overrun by the Persians, or invaded by Greek, Roman, Turk, or Russian, was a large independent kingdom, ruled over by its native princes.

Successive wars and conquests; changes of masters, and of

dynasties, vicissitudes of fortune of all kinds had reduced Armenia, in the 14th century to the lowest stage of ruin and degradation. A large admixture of creeds was a necessary result of so many races having been its possessors and inhabitants. Sabeanism, Magism, Zoroaster tenets, Greek and Roman Polytheism, Deism, Arianism, and Mohammedanism, all contributed their quota of dogmas and doctrine to the general stock of Christianity, degrading and debasing it to the condition in which it existed at the beginning of the 15th century.

There is one remarkable characteristic of the Armenians worthy of observation; wherever they are dispersed, like the Jews, they preserve a distinct national and religious existence, mingling with other races in commerce, but never incorporating with them, and always looking forward to their restoration as a nation, and their return to the old land from which they originally came.

The language of the Armenians in common use in their families, not only in Turkey, but in Egypt, is the Turkish. Their literary and religious language, however, is entirely different from the spoken one, and they claim for it an antiquity amply sufficient for its respectability—a date before the Deluge. The invention, however, of the alphabet in which it is written, is due to Mesrob.

There may be some Antiquarian honour and dignity in being (as Armenia had been) a tributary province of the greatest nations of antiquity, of Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Greece, and Rome.

About 260 A.D. Christianity first gained a footing in Armenia, but even in the lifetime of Our Saviour, some knowledge of Christ and his Gospel is said to have been brought into Armenia by St. Bartholomew the Apostle, and Thadeus, one of the seventy-two disciples. Syrian priests subsequently preached the Gospel in Armenia, and erected many monasteries on the ruins of Pagan temples.

The great Apostle of Armenia was St. Gregory, surnamed "the enlightener," who commenced his apostolic labours in that

country at the close of the third century, and converted the heathen king, Tiridates in the year of our Lord 302. He instituted the Patriarchal see, of which he was the first occupant, the title of which Patriarchate was Catophigos—the *Universal.* St. Gregory died in 342.

The introduction of Christianity into Armenia was followed by the dissemination of learning and science, and with surprising manifestations of intellectual activity for so limited a theatre for such exhibitions as that of Armenian life. Men of great mark and moment in literary and religious affairs started up, such as St. James of Nisiba, St. Isaac the Great, Mesrob, who invented the Armenian Alphabet, the historians, Phaustus and Khoren, the philosopher, David, &c. At the end of the 10th century, however, Armenia was torn by religious schisms, party strife, and rivalries, ready to fall into the hands of any enemy who was strong, and whose followers were united. The Saracen caliphs came into Armenia, saw, and conquered. Islamism accordingly over-ran the country. A portion of the Armenians fled northwards, settled between Kars and Ani, became an Armenian sovereignty, and subsisted for about a century under the name of the Kingdom of Ani, till it was ravaged and desolated by the Mongols.

Those who escaped with some of the Armenian Princes, styled Melik, or Kings, took refuge in strong castles, where they long retained, and in some of which they still retain the vain title of Melik. At the time of the dispersion by the Mongols, some of the Armenians fled into Cilicia, and founded a small state at Tarsus. There they existed at the time of the Crusades. They came to the support of the Christian cause, and "fought valiantly under the banners of the Princes of Antioch."

In the 14th century the poor Armenians and the King of Tarsus were threatened with destruction by the Mohammedans. In vain they appealed for succour to the Court of Rome, and to the Christian Princes of the Latin Church. The services of the

Schismatic Armenians, living under their own Patriarch, were forgotten, their appeal was disregarded.

The island of Cyprus, opposite the Silician coast, was at that period held by the Franks under a Prince of the House of Lusignan. An Armenian King at this juncture dying without heirs, the people offered their vacant throne to a Prince of the Lusignan House, and the offer was accepted. But the Turks made small account in Armenia of the House of Lusignan in Cyprus. An effort was made by the Knights of Rhodes on behalf of the Armenians, worthy of their valour and their order, but it failed, the Cross was thrown down from the steeples of the churches of Tarsus, and the Crescent was erected in its room. The standard of Mahomet of course finds favour in the sight of a deadly enemy of Christianity. Gibbon has nothing in catastrophes of this kind but triumph, of one order of fanaticism over that of another. The little Christian kingdom of Tarsus fell, and the last sovereign of the House of Lusignan, Leo the VI., after years of captivity in Jerusalem and Cario, died in Paris in 1303, and was buried in the church of the Celestins. A recumbent statue of the last of the Lusignans is still to be seen in the vaults of St. Denis.

If in all humility of spirit, and with due deference to public opinion, as it is expressed in the British Press, and reverence for the God whom Lord John Russell worships—Success—I might, in honour of the heroism and courage that has been unfortunate, pronounce a few words at the foot of this grave without offence, I would say—" Sta viator, heroem Calcas !"

A very small portion of the ancient territory of Armenia now remains subject to the Turkish dominion, and that small portion is ruled by Kurd chieftains under the normal sovereignty of the Porte.

From the time of the Turkish conquest of the Greek empire by Mahommed the II., the Armenians have had their Patriarch with all the rights and immunities of other patriarchs established at Constantinople.

In 1827 an impulse was given to the Nationalist tendencies of Armenian minds by the cession of a considerable portion of ancient Armenia to Russia by Persia and the conclusion of a treaty entered into and ratified the 22nd of February in that year, confirming that cession.

It has invariably happened that whenever Russia has gained any advantage in the East either by arms or diplomacy, whether in Turkey and its provinces, or in Persia and her provinces, such as was gained by the Russians, by their acquisition of the Crimea, by the cession to them of Georgia, on the part of the last native sovereign, George the XIII., in 1800, and by the cession to them of Armenian territory in 1827, the Christian Rayahs, most considerable of the communities, Greeks and Armenians of the Turkish empire have always been agitated and excited, and animated with hopes of deliverance from the Turkish yoke.

At the end of the last Russian campaign against Persia, when the latter had to cede two Armenian provinces to the Russians, the chief importance it is said attached to this cession by the latter, was the acquisition of the monastery of Ecmiazen, the seat of an Armenian Patriarch and the religious centre of all Armenia.

The Armenians in the Ottoman empire are estimated at 2,400,000, an approximate computation, and probably below the truth. Their numbers in European Turkey hardly exceed 400,000, of which about half reside in Constantinople. The great majority, amounting to about two millions, exist in Asia minor. The Armenian population throughout the whole world is estimated at four millions, of which their numbers in Russia are nine hundred thousand, in Persia six hundred thousand, in India and other realms of Asia forty thousand, in various European countries sixty thousand.

The aphorism of Homer—"The day that a man is deprived of his liberty half his worth is taken away," applies to the degraded conditions of all the Rayahs of the Turkish empire, but in an especial manner to the Armenians. They fell into servi-

tude from a a higher moral eminence than the Greeks. In their native country, in possession of it, and the enjoyment of the rights which God and nature gave them, they were a brave people, of a burly independent spirit, of a warlike disposition, but not in the sense of the predatory hordes around them. But during centuries of servitude, and that worst form of it under the stupid despotism of Turkish rule, all the manly instincts of their nature have been lost. The love of lucre, and the dread of rapacious tyranny have rendered them crafty and greedy of gain, timid, servile, and double dealing. Contact with Europeans has not improved them, the affectation of European manners and modes of thinking have tended to weaken the little that remained of national virtue, and to bring the national traditions to which they so long pertinaciously clung, into disrepute. In the changes that are impending it is difficult to imagine what their destiny may be. At the present time they are neither formidable to the Turks, nor very favourably disposed towards the Russians.

"The Armenians (says the Abbé Michou) have three independent Patriarchs, one of Etmiazin, one of Cis, and one of Aktamar, in Great Armenia. The Patriarch of Ecmiazin, in Russian Armenia, takes the title of *Catholico*, which means, universal head of the Armenians. The actual prelate is an intelligent prelate. The convent of Ecmiazin is one of the most important in all Armenia. There are found the best informed ecclesiastics. A priest of this convent studied at the school of Moscow.

"The bishops are nominated by the patriarchs, and are dependent upon them. Generally the bishoprics are sold to the highest bidder. Sometimes the diocese ask the Patriarch for a person whom they like. They obtain him; but always have to pay for the appointment. This is also done in the Greek Church.

"The revenues of the Armenian churches consist of the offerings of the faithful, lands, and other real property, the administration of which is intrusted to the synod. But at the bottom, the bishops manage them.

"To be an Armenian priest, it is sufficient to know how to read. Thus, the ignorance of the priests is so great, that many do not know the catechism. They marry before ordination. Their morals are generally blameless. They are unfortunate artisans, or ruined men, who receive the protection of some bishop, and receive ordination from him. The faithful support them. Their children are generally husbandmen. Amongst these priests, some are unmarried men; they are called *vartabet*, a word signifying doctors. They enjoy greater esteem than the rest, and out of them the bishops are chosen. These, in the Armenian, as well as the Greek Church, cannot marry. Sometimes bishops are taken out of the monks, but with a dispensation from the Patriarch, because the canons say that a monk cannot be a bishop. M. Tchamourdjan, to raise the Armenian Church, proposed to the patriarchal council to give the most important places to those ecclesiastics who had passed through a course of study. His advice was rejected, and the old routine is kept to.

"The Armenians, like the Greeks, go to church and say prayers early in the morning, and devote the rest of the day to work. Their liturgies go back to the time of St. Chrysostom.

"They have two synods, one spiritual, the other temporal. The patriarchal vicar is named Jacobo.

"The priests of the Latin ritual at Constantinople amount to forty regular and eight secular. The former comprise the French Lazarists, and different orders of the Franciscans; the others are the Græco-Latin priests of the island employed in the parishes. There are, further, two houses of the Brothers of Christian Schools, and two houses of the Sisters of St. Vincent de Paul.

"Among the Latins there are a good many Armenians from Aleppo. The Armenian Catholic Patriarch was anxious to draw them into his nation, but they resolved to remain Latins. They preferred the general tolerance of the Latin Church, to the strictness of Christian discipline, still rigorously preserved among the Armenians. The Latin nation had, about twelve

years ago, a temporal chief, who was a priest. At present he is a layman. His name is M. G. Varthaliti. He is paid by the nation whom he represents, and for whom he acts. Each nation has its council, which is also called a deputation. The members of the council are elected every three or four years by the general assembly.

"The Greek Catholic ritual united with Rome, has at Constantinople only a little chapel, served by one priest and his deacon. The community consists of about fifty faithful, almost all Syrians.

"The Catholic Armenians are much more numerous at this time: intestine dissensions disturb their union. These dissensious were so great that the Patriarch was sent to Rome. The question on which the Armenians are divided is this:—one party, brought up by the Propaganda of Rome, are bent upon abolishing the Armenian ritual, and upon Latinising the nation by introducing the customs, ceremonies, and liturgy of Rome. The others wish to preserve their ritual and ancient liturgy. The learned and pious Mekatarists of Venice and Paris belong to the latter party. They are convinced that the way to delay, and to, perhaps, prevent the union of the Armenians still separated from Rome, is to manifest a tendency of robbing the nation of its national liturgy. They know that attachment to this liturgy has been a powerful means of preservation for the faith, and they fear the religious indifference which might follow the introduction of a ritual to which the Armenians are completely strangers, however worthy of respect as the ritual of the mother Church.

"There is no doubt that Rome does not understand the importance of preserving the rituals of the different nations who return to Catholicism, and does not blame the short-sighted zeal of men who believe they do her service by imposing upon other nations liturgies and customs foreign to their education and religious habits."*

* Narrative of a Journey in the East, 1850.

THE INFERIOR ARMENIAN CLERGY.

There are two classes, Derders, or ordinary Priests, or Vartabieds, or Doctors in Theology. The latter, the most learned, are enjoined celibacy, while the Derders may exercise their functions as priests in the married state.

The Armenian clergy spring from the people, generally from common workmen, humble artisans, and small tradesmen. Very little previous study is required to fit the candidate for orders in the rank of ordinary priests for ordination.

In every parish there is a lay administrator of the pious and charitable foundations belonging to the Church, called Mulevelle; when a priest is wanted for the church, the administrator is informed, and that person, who is generally a man of local rank and influence, exercises his patronage by choosing some humble follower or retainer, who has received some elementary education, can read and write, and recommends him to the suffrages of the faithful, and forthwith the election takes place, and the nomination of the recommended person follows as a matter of course, and that person, at the expiration of forty days noviciate and probation, all at once steps into ecclesiastical life, a ready-made *Armenian divine*, presumed to be perfect at all points in the sacred character and functions wherewith he was then invested at once and for evermore.

A preliminary form is, however, gone through; a petition is sent by the electors to the Patriarch, praying for the confirmation of the election made by them. The prayer of that petition is signed by all the clergy and parishioners, as well as by the Mulevelle, and that petition is always assented to.

The petition is accepted as a sufficient guarantee for the moral character of the candidate, but the formality must be gone through of a public examination, according to the ritual, as to qualifications, the candidate previously having re-

ceived minor orders, including the order of deacon. The formula of the ritual comprise answers to questions easily learned by a slight exercise of memory, and a night passed in prayer and hymns in the church. And on the following day the candidate for holy orders is consecrated. The obvious evils of this system of ordination has suggested improvements of late years in it, but the improvements have led to other evils. The test of moral conduct is now merged to a considerable extent in one of proficiency in the literary language of Armenia, and acquaintance with ecclesiastical works in that idiom. The candidate must now be a person of a higher rank, but his respectability is a matter of more consideration than that of faith or morals. It remains to combine both considerations, but in the meantime, great jealousies are excited between the educated and non-educated postulants, and the former appear, when sent forth as missionary priests, to have more influence over the masses of their community than the former.

If any one thinks it worth his while to know what my practical experience is of this mode of supplying the Armenian church with clergy, I am bound to say the result is favourable to religion, so far as the appointment is concerned of men who are perfectly sincere, strictly moral, and devoted to their duties.

The Armenian clergy receive no fixed support, and exact no prescribed contributions from their flocks like the Greek clergy. Their revenue depends mainly on the voluntary contributions of the faithful. A rich priest is a rara avis in ecclesia Armeniæ. They receive grants in aid of voluntary contributions from the fund of pious and charitable foundations in every district, designated Vacoub.

What we would call parishes are districts of churches, to each of which a certain number of families are assigned to the care of a sufficient number of ecclesiastics. The clergy of one district cannot interfere with those of another in the celebration of any religious services, or administration of Sacrament. The working clergy have no contributions to pay to the patriarch

or bishops, nor can they exact any from the people except for baptisms, marriages and funerals, the fees of which are regulated by a tariff publicly placed in every church. The principal voluntary contributions are those collected twice a year from the faithful, at the feast of the Epiphany and Easter. The ordinary collections for the maintenance of the church and its requirements are made on Sundays and festivals, and the octave from Easter to Whitsuntide.

THE ARMENIAN MONASTIC INSTITUTIONS.

Formerly monks and monasteries abounded in the Turkish empire. At the present time monasteries are becoming rare, and those which exist are generally in a ruinous condition. Consequently monks are become rare also, for it is a consequence I think in all countries with which I am acquainted, with one exception, that where edifices do not exist for ecclesiastical purposes, congregations for them diminish rapidly, and at length cease to exist at all. I speak of countries whose people, or large communities of them, have been persecuted on account of their religious tenets.

The mode of life of Armenian monks is hardly less austere than that of Greek inmates of monasteries; one meal a day, consisting of herbs, other vegetables, and pulse is their ordinary sustenance; their exceptional luxuries of oil, milk, and fish is for two days in the week—Saturdays and Sundays. Their noviciate is long and arduous, it is only at the expiration of eight years probation they are entitled to the habit of the order, and during forty days previously to their arriving at that dignity, they remain in solitude, silence, and seclusion, even from the light of day. Other literature besides that of their liturgies, ritual,

and works on dogmatic and ascetic theology, is neither cultivated nor encouraged in the monasteries, nor indeed permitted, except to superiors of long standing and well ascertained orthodoxy. There are exceptions, however, to this rule in a few ancient monasteries, formerly renowned for the cultivation of science or letters, and where the odour of those pursuits still hang about the dilapidated walls of their dreary houses. The Convent of St. James, at Jerusalem is the residence of the Armenian Bishop of that city, who has the honorary title of Patriarch, and possesses larger revenues derived from the Vacoufs and offerings from pilgrims than any other Armenian monastery in the Levant.

The monastery of St. John the Baptist, near Mouch, ranks next in these respects. Next in order of eminence and claims to veneration are the episcopal monasteries of Angora and Tokal, and that of *Armach*, near Nicomedia, the latter having a seminary for students destined for the priesthood. The archives of the latter might be worthy the attention of Irish Archæologists. There are many Armenian monasteries of minor importance in Asia Minor, the Abbots and officiating ecclesiastics, of which many are married and reside with their families in the convents, and look upon the revenues of them, it is said, so much as hereditary property, that when one of the Superiors dies, the government of the monastery passes to his son as an inheritance.

Constantinople and its precincts contain thirty Armenian churches, one to each district of defined limits, to which the cure of a certain number of souls is committed. The ecclesiastical districts both in the capital and its suburbs, and generally in the provinces in large towns and their vicinity, have free schools of primary instruction connected with them, in which the children of the district learn to read and write, are instructed in their catechism, and taught the elements of arithmetic. The schools in the capital, formerly ill-supported by their several ecclesiastical districts, are now tolerably well maintained from a general fund for educational purposes.

The poor thus obtain some knowledge that is useful to them, and sufficient for their simple lives.

The upper class, at least the opulent mercantile community, the successful money changers, money lenders, money brokers, bankers, jobbers in securities, speculators in Government securities, loan makers on mortgaged salaries to Pachas and Mudirs, advancers of bribes to functionaries of State, civil and judicial; the sarrafs which compose this Armenian aristocracy obtain their education in foreign countries, Germany, France, and Italy. Attempts have been made to establish Armenian colleges in Turkey, but they have been unsuccessful. The labours of Mechita, however, have not been in vain. They have given the upper classes a taste for letters, a desire for knowledge, and there are many Armenians of the present day not only literary, but learned men.

The education of the female sex of their community of this aristocracy is limited to primary instruction, the elements of arithmetic, geography, embroidery, the social science of feminine grace, propriety, conventionalism, in the "minor morals," of manners, carriage and deportment—in a word, genteel behaviour before the world. Music forms no part of their accomplishments.

I have lived on terms of familiar intercourse with many Armenian families of the first rank in their several communities, in former years, and I cannot say I remember ever seeing a book in an Armenian lady's hand, or hearing one spoken of, or seeing a piano or harp played by one of them.

They get on in society, however, marvellously well without those accomplishments, and are by no means unrefined, unwinning, or uncivilised. Their women of high rank are remarkably beautiful, graceful, and elegantly indolent, if I may be allowed the expression.

The class in which the want of education is felt, seen, and most lamentably obvious, is in the middle class of the Armenian community. That class, which in Ireland, perhaps no less

than that of which I am speaking, in the Turkish dominions, suffers from the want of any kind of knowledge commensurate with the necessity for it, and the requirements of the position in which they move, or to which they seek to ascend.

The Armenian middle class are deficient alike in moral and intellectual qualities of a high order. They are vain and selfish braggards and poltroons, insolent to inferiors, servile and sycophantic to superiors, sharp, acute, and astute in business matters, not very sensible of the value or importance of any distinction between truth and falsehood, and exceedingly proud of their race and religion, without having the slightest knowledge of the history of either.

As far as their means allow, and probably in many instances beyond them, they indulge in that peculiar passion which the money broker aristocracy of their community indulge in so largely—ostentation in the *interior* of their dwellings, while the exterior will denote nothing but decay, dilapidation, dirt and dinginess, penury and gloom.

It is astonishing what fine furniture, expensive carpets, gawdy pictures, costly pipes are to be found in the abodes of Armenians who are only clerks to saraffs, agents, and factors to merchants. Ostentation within doors is the ruling passion, indeed, of all classes of the Armenian community above the lower.

The women of the Armenian Catholic community have generally abandoned the use of the yashmah and the feredgé, the veil and the large flowing outer garment, formerly used by them in common with the Turkish women.

But in adopting French fashions, their manners and modes of thinking remain Armenian.

The Armenians have suffered much at various periods, from the intolerance as well as the rapacity of the Turks, even in the reign of the late reforming Sultan, Mahmoud.

The Ottoman Porte gave its faithful Christian allies a striking specimen of the power of Reform, and the progress of en-

lightenment and toleration in 1843, in the spectacle of an execution of a young Armenian, twenty-two years of age only, named Ovaghian, for the crime of returning to his own Christian faith, which he had professedly renounced, probably in some fit of rage and passion, the result of domestic strife. In his sane moments, reflecting with horror on what he had done, he determined to abandon Stamboul and the religion of Mohammed, proceeded to the island of Syra, abjured Islamism, and substitued the hat for the turban, and after some time returned, as he thought, incognito to Stamboul. But he was soon recognised, arrested, tried before a tribunal of those holy men and doctors of the law of Islam, convicted, and had his head chopped off by that "most tolerant of all governments," the Turkish Government.

It fell, however, to the lot of the British minister, who thinks most favourably of the tolerant spirit of Turkish rule, to cause the ambassador of his nation at the Porte, to remonstrate loudly and angrily against the execution of the Armenian for the exercise of religious right, and such was the angry nature of the communications between the British ambassador, Sir Stratford Canning, and the Porte on this subject, that a rupture between the two governments was imminent. The ambassador demanding an abrogation of the atrocious law, under which the Armenian Christian had been put to death, the Sultan and his ministers declaring most truly, that the law was based on a fundamental principle of their religion, that the Koran not only sanctioned the penalty of death for apostacy, but ordained it, and that neither the Sultan nor the Porte had any power to abrogate what the law of Islam had ordained. The energetic British minister insisted in vain that the law should be abrogated. He then precipitately quitted Constantinople, and with all his suite went on board a British vessel of war, sailed for the Dardanelles, giving the Porte three days to deliberate on the final demand, preferred at the moment of his departure.

The young Sultan and the Divan, terrified, and, indeed, it

may be added, bullied into a violation of a fundamental law of the Mohammedan religion, speedily despatched a messenger after the importunate ambassador, consenting to abrogate all that he and his government were called upon to do. Accordingly the laws and the religion of the Turkish Empire were violated at the bidding of a Christian Power, and from that time the independence and prestige of the nation, and the only vital power of the Turkish government, its uncontrolled fanaticism, were struck down; from that blow greater mischief has been done to Turkish power, than it has sustained at the hands of any other Christian Power.

The influence at the Porte of Sir Stratford Canning from that time, was apparently commensurate with his successful bullying diplomacy, but probably the tone of triumph, and extravagant eulogy, with which the ambassador's success on this occasion was spoken of in the British Press and Parliament, led to mistaken views of the superiority of British influence at the Porte over that of every other nation.

A sudden impetus was then given to Protestant missionary labours in the Levant. Three years later, having been pushed on with an amount of energy corresponding to the high degree of influence supposed to be possessed by the British minister at the Porte, the other Christian communities were spiritually warred on by the new missionaries, pretty much the same way that Roman Catholics in Ireland are at this day warred on for the salvation of their souls. Their tenets were assailed, their schools and the dwellings of their poor were fired into with tracts and Bibles, their children were made presents, their servants were taken into pay, their priests were reviled, and the missionary societies at home were made glad and thankful to the Lord for glowing accounts of success among the heathen, and thereby for large subscriptions at home, and ample funds for their apostolic operations in foreign parts.

THE COMMUNITY OF UNITED ARMENIANS CONNECTED WITH THE CHURCH OF ROME IN TURKEY.

The origin of the schism of the Armenian Church and its separation from that of Rome, dates from the 6th century. It began, like many other schisms, in a war of words, in selfish but not sordid feelings, in exorbitant pretensions and inordinate pride, and as it progressed and extended in point of locality, as well as in regards to tenets of controverted subjects of discussion, human passions became more deeply and deeply engaged in these contentions, and dissidences in matters of opinion and discipline, became schism, involving questions of doctrines taught by authority, and required by authority to be received. The Council of Chalcedon, the 4th œcumenical council, assembled during the Pontificate of Saint Leo, had condemned the Eutychian heresy, and defined and declared the received opinion of the Roman Catholic churches throughout the world of all previous times, namely, that the divine and human natures united in our Saviour, formed a single person only.

The partisans of Eutychius, and especially his disciple of Dioscarus in Asia, propagated a report that the Council of Chalcedon had admitted a duality of persons, and renewed the errors of Nestorius. The Armenians were then hostile to their Greek rulers, and were easily led to adopt any views which were hostile to theirs, either of a religious or a political kind. They allowed themselves to be convinced that the Latin Church had fallen into the errors of Eutychius, and in the year A.D. 596 the formal separation of the Armenian Church from that of Rome was effected and completed, and it has endured upwards of twelve centuries and a half, with an amount of bitter bad

feeling that would be almost incredible, considering the nature of the differences between the two Churches, were it not for the reflection that the more groundless are the misapprehensions of unacquainted neighbours, the more unfounded are the suspicions and jealousies of families, communities, and nations, on the same borders of each other, of those nearest to us in blood, in the bonds of faith, and in race as well as religion, the more vehement are such suspicions and jealousies, and the more violent are the quarrels engendered by them.

Poor humanity, it is asserted daily in our press, in our literary, and scientific, and philosophical, and religious journals, is advancing towards perfection in social science, making rapid progress in political economy, improving vastly and visibly everywhere, even in Turkey, and progressing in civilisation. In fact, we are taught to believe, in this age of ours, that people every day are becoming wiser, and worthier of happiness in this world and the next; become every day less subject to infirmities, prejudices, mistaken views of economical, industrial, and social interests.

Alas! my experience leads me to no such conclusions. I do not find in the course of my reading of history, nor in my travels either in the east or in the west, evidence of any such happy change. As for poor Armenian humanity, it wears the same garb, sees with the same eyes, thinks with the same organ, reasons with the same powers, feels with the same tendencies of passion to excite, exaggerate, mislead, and misrepresent, to make false mediums, false appearances, false facts, false inferences, and false consciences.

Poor humanity is not a whit better in the heart of that Armenian community of which I treat, in the year of grace 1860, than it was in the year of the great schism of its Church, A.D. 596.

And let me ask the great authorities, the men of master minds, and of a great fame in social science, in political economy, the religious movement, in legislative and judicial vocations in the British dominions, is humanity there more

divested of its infirmities, rendered less subject to passions, weaknesses, miseries of all kinds, domineered over by fewer prejudices than it is in other countries, or has been even three hundred years ago?

The truthful reply to that inquiry most assuredly would be, *no essential change has taken place in its constitution.*

Human passions and infirmities change their aspects, garb, and mode of expression, from time to time, and the mystery and ascendancy of each of them may alternate and modify for the time being the phases of national character, without altering its nature. Humanity at large is changed effectually for the better, only by the influences of religion, and truly civilized only by the influence of genuine Christian principles.

The chief points at variance between the Armenian and the Latin Church, are the following :—1st, The Armenian Church rejects the supremacy of the Church and See of Rome. 2nd, rejects the Council of Chalcedon. 3rd, denies that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father. 4th, rejects Purgatory. 5th, rejects indulgences. 6th, retains certain rites of Paganism, such as the sacrifice of some animals, which sacrifice is called "Madagh."

At various times, between the three Patriarchs of the Armenian Church—the chief, or universal, at Ecmiazin, the second in Cilicia, the third at Pitani, there have been serious feuds and ecclesiastical quarrels.

There have been ninety-two Patriarchs of the Armenian Church, successors to St. Gregory. Several of them have been men of great Christian virtues, of heroic benevolence, munificence, and resolution in the discharge of their spiritual functions, none more so than Nersis, Archbishop of Georgia, whose independence not suiting the Russian Government, he was summoned to St. Petersburg, and banished to Besarabia. In 1843, the united suffrages of all the Armenian churches in Russia, Persia, Turkey, and its provinces, called this venerable prelate to the Patriarchal See of Ecmiazin, in the vicinity of Arazof.

The Armenian schism would probably have died out of mere inanition, if such a vast amount of superfluous pains had not been taken at the commencement to extinguish it. The more it was anathematised, the more obstinate it became in error. There is reason to believe the Armenians imagined that the Latin Church had adopted the errors of Eutychius, and yet with no little inconsistency, they rejected the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, by which Eutychius was condemned, and also the epistle of Pope Leo, which has reference to the same subject. The Armenian Church has been from its origin in a state of vacillation, hesitating in its conclusions on many matters, and halting between the doctrines of the Greek and Latin Churches, but clinging pertinaciously to its old ritual, discipline, and fundamental doctrines.

The Roman Catholic Armenian community in the Turkish Empire is estimated at forty thousand souls, but in this estimate I am disposed to think that those in Egypt are not included, but their number does not largely affect the preceding estimate. In Constantinople the Armenian Catholics amount to seventeen thousand, those of Trebizond two thousand five hundred, those of Angora nine thousand, those of Erzeroun four thousand, those of Artwin fifteen hundred, and those of Broussa one thousand.

In 1622, Pope Gregory XV. founded the Propaganda, or Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, at Rome; and to this establishment Gregory's successor, Urban VIII., joined the Collegio della Propaganda, with the intention of furnishing missionaries to all parts of the globe. I do not believe that the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith has always exercised a wise discretion, or has always promoted the true interests of the Roman Catholic church, by the proceedings it has adopted, either in relation to the schismatic churches in the East, or to those churches which have come out of the schism and sought reconciliation with the Latin Church.

The proceedings of the Congregation at one period, and with one class of schismatics, or communities returning to

the Latin Church, have been too violent; and, at another time, and with another community approaching union with it, or arrived at the first stage of union, has been too arrogant, too unyielding in its requirements, too rigorous in the enforcement of its views, too meddlesome in affairs of mere discipline, and too regardless, not only of the prejudices, but of the rights and privileges of churches long separated from the Latin Church, especially with regard to the appointment of prelates and other ecclesiastical dignitaries. This mistake has been productive of infinite advantage to the Greek Orthodox Church, and of incalculable mischief to the true interests of the Roman Catholic Church in the East. The violent efforts made at the beginning of the eighteenth century to detach the Armenians from their schism, were of the kind above referred to.

A few years previously (1587), Pope Sextus V. had sent an ambassador to the Greek communities of Syria, consisting of the Armenians, Melkites, Jacobites and Chaldeans, with the view of effecting a reconciliation with the schismatic churches; but the effort was virtually a failure, although the Armenian Patriarch of Cilicia had been induced to sign a confession of the Catholic faith, according to the statutes of the Council of Florence.

About a century later an Armenian priest, named Mechitar, renewed the unsuccessful attempt, after he had been induced by the Fathers of the Jesuit Order at Aleppo to return to the Roman Catholic faith. He became an enthusiast, too, in his efforts to reclaim his schismatic brethren; founded a religious society or order, the main object of which was the union of churches, and commenced the mission which he assigned to himself at Constantinople, in 1700. From that time we find the Armenian Church at Constantinople a prey to dissension. All the old controversies, that had been dormant for centuries, were revived. The agents employed by the Propaganda carried things with a very high hand, attacking the liturgy and practises of the ancient Armenian Church with extreme violence;

while the Armenian Patriarch and his partizans secretly and actively intrigued against the agents of the Congregation and their abettors; denounced them to the Ottoman Porte, and represented them as conspirators against the Turkish state. This old polemical policy of maligning, discrediting, and bringing State power to work the destruction of religious opponents, was eminently successful on that occasion. The Patriarch obtained a firman from the Porte ordering the banishment of the missionaries from Rome, and forbidding any one to harbour them on pain of death, and prohibiting Armenian Catholics to frequent any churches but those in communion with the Armenian Patriarch.

The successor of the wily Patriarch above-mentioned, in 1702, carried on the war with Roman Catholics with increased fury. The College of the Jesuits at Erzeroum, which contained three hundred young Armenians, converted to the Roman Catholic faith, was closed by order of the government. The Fathers, forced to disperse, took refuge in adjacent countries, chiefly in Persia. There is a very singular comment on this persecution in the number of European renegades, chiefly Italian Roman Catholics, who about this time had embraced the faith of Mohammed, and Von Hammer makes mention of one who, to prove the truth of his conversion, in the presence of the Grand Vizier, had trampled on the host.

But the triumph of the persecuting Armenian Patriarch was of short duration. In 1703, the French Ambassador, M. de Feriol, came forward in defence of the Roman Catholics, and obtained an order from the Porte for the deposition and banishment of the persecuting Armenian Patriarch.

Soon after, the influence of the rich Armenians of Constantinople was brought to bear at the influence of the French Ambassador. The banished Patriarch, on his way to the island of Scio, the place of banishment assigned to him, was said to have been secretly carried off and conveyed to a foreign land—some said to Marseilles, others to Messina, and those who were determined to be circumstantial, averred he was

brought to the island of St. Marguerite, where he died "of martyrdom," but what particular disease or catastrophe is implied by that expression is not quite clear. Some imaginative people, in after time, adduced arguments in favour of the supposition that the abducted Armenian patriarch was the Man in the Iron Mask.

There is nothing so effective as a vague rumour that barely hints a crime, and insinuates a suspicion of guilt, for inculpating an obnoxious individual, or society. It never was proved that the Patriarch was abducted at all, that he had not effected his escape, that he had not been rescued and delivered from his doom by his co-religionists; but it was first whispered about, and afterwards openly avowed, there being good grounds for suspecting that the poor Patriarch had been made away with by the Jesuits.

This was an ingenious device of the orthodox faithful to ruin the Jesuits in the capital, and once more the Armenians had a partial and temporary triumph.

The Porte was again moved by the Armenians to side with them. God only knows how many purses were judiciously bestowed in bribing the principal black and white eunuchs of the seraglio, the ministers of state the grand functionaries, and the ministers of the seraglio of the Sultan. Certain it is the Jesuits were banished from Galata, their printing press in the palace of the French Ambassador was forbidden to be used, Roman Catholics were prohibited from proselytizing on pain of banishment, and, by a special hatti sheriffe, the arrest of all Armenians who had united themselves to the Roman Catholic religion was decreed. Vast numbers were seized. Seven of the captured Armenians apostatised to save their lives; three others (priests), who refused to follow the example of the seven apostates, were put to death, near the gate of Pamma Capou. So much for the tolerant spirit of the Turkish government!

The Armenian priest, Mechitar, in the meantime, pursued his plan for the union of the two Churches. But, although he

had embraced the Roman Catholic religion, he did not approve of the measures of the Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith. He fled from its missionaries at Constantinople, and took refuge in the Morea, where he founded, at Modon, a monastery according to the rule of St. Benedict, subsequently approved by a bull of Pope Clement XI. Some years later, when the Morea was overrun by the Turks, he was obliged to fly, and seek an asylum in Venice. There, the fame of his piety and patriotism having preceded him, he obtained from the republic the grant of the little island of St. Lazarus, and an establishment which had served for an hospital for lepers in the middle ages. He founded a convent of Armenian monks, who were called Mechitarists, from the name of the founder, and by these monks and their successors Armenia was rendered famous throughout the East. The master idea that animated the mind of Mechitar, and his plan for the extinction of schism, and the unity of the churches, was the promotion of national and religious interests. It is said that he was more attached to Mount Ararat than to the Vatican, and that his zeal for the Roman Catholic religion was subordinate to his ardour for national emancipation. I doubt very much the truth of this supposition, but it is very probable that the disciples and followers of Mechitar, in the course of time, and the progress of a feud gradually increasing in rancour as the violence of its contending claims progressed, allowed their national feelings to get the mastery over their religious principles.

Mechitar died in 1749 in his convent at St. Lazarus. But the feud which he engendered is not buried with his bones, it still lives and rancours in the bosom of the Armenio-Catholic community at Constantinople at this day, and threatens its dissolution.

In 1759, the Armenian Patriarch of Constantinople, strengthened with new influence at the Porte exercised his power in a fresh persecution of the Armenian Catholics. The sufferings endured by them were embodied in a petition presented the

same year to the Polish ambassador, praying for his interference in their behalf. In that document they attribute their persecution to their refusal to do many things the Patriarch would compel them to perform or assent to, namely :—

"1st. To falsify several passages of Scripture. 2nd. To condemn the council of Chalcedon. 3rd. To deny purgatory. 4th. To admit the dogma that God might die nine times in a day. 5th. To believe in the legality of usury. 6th. To celebrate the nativity of Christ on the 6th January. 7th. To offer a sacrifice of bulls with rites and ceremonies borrowed from the worship of Mithra."

The Roman Catholic Armenian community was at first spiritually governed by an archbishop of the Latin church, and civilly by a nazir who was a Mohammedan. This arrangement placed the community of Armenian Roman Catholics, in an inferior position to that of any other Christian community in the Turkish Empire. The ambassadors of Roman Catholic nations at the Porte, but chiefly the representative of the French court, renewed their interference on behalf of the Armenian Roman Catholic community, and they succeeded in getting rid of the Turkish Nazir, and combining the civil and spiritual authority of the community in a bishop, having the authority, but not bearing the title of a Patriarch. But this community was not satisfied; they would have a Patriarch of their own, and they got one by dint of persecution, for never in this world has a persecution on a grand scale been so successfully persecuted on a small one as the unfortunate Ottoman Porte has been in its decrepitude by remonstrances and complaints by all the conflicting communities of Christian rayahs throughout the Turkish empire, continually urged upon its attention by European ambassadors of Catholic and Protestant states, of heterodox and orthodox churches, each representing a government jealous of the other, and by all the means at its disposal, legitimate or base, *per fas aut nefas*, seeking to thwart and frustrate the policy of a rival power by

undermining the Christian influence of its representative at the Court of a Mahommedan sovereign.

The Armenian Roman Catholics from the period of the appointment of a patriarch became a separated community entirely distinct from the old anti-Roman Armenian one, having their own facilities for bringing their grievances to the footstool of the Padishaw.

The unfortunate Mahommedan dominion in Turkey in its decrepitude and decline, has had no peace for the last century, especially for any length of time, in the exercise of its peculiar notions of toleration: complaints, remonstrances, threats of Christian sovereigns through their ambassadors on account of outrages on Christian rayahs, seem never to cease persecuting that "most tolerant of all governments," as a British Minister is pleased to designate that of Turkey.

In 1821, in one of those panics of ordinary occurrence in Constantinople, in which great masses of the Mahommedan population, and considerable numbers of the functionaries of the State, from the highest to the lowest, become involved whenever an insurrection of rayahs breaks out in a distant province, or a war with Russia is apprehended, the Armenian community, and especially the members of it of the Roman Catholic church were menaced with destruction, but happily on that occasion terrified fanaticism was satisfied with the ruin and extermination only of the powerful Catholic family of Oglou.

A little later, another panic was followed by a new persecution of Christians.

In the Turkish capital a religious war had been proclaimed officially by the Sultan the 18th December, 1827. Nothing could exceed the exasperation of the whole Turkish population, and the same Sultan Mahmoud, who a little later was a reformer of abuses. A promulgator of edicts enjoining toleration was on this occasion actuated in all his acts by feelings at once sanguinary and fanatical in the extreme. He medi-

tated for some time the extermination of all the Christian rayahs in the capital, but fortunately was induced to abandon the atrocious project.

A fierce persecution of Christians, however, was carried on, and those who suffered most were the Armenian Roman Catholics, who were accused not only by the Turks, but their other equally deadly enemies of the two, so called, orthodox churches.

On the 8th of January, 1828, by a public edict, the principal Roman Catholic Armenian bankers and merchants were banished, and their houses and country houses and stores were taken possession of by Turkish soldiers.

All the Armenians of Angora residing in Constantinople were ordered to depart forthwith from the capital and had to fly, leaving all their effects and property behind them. By a new edict the whole of the Roman Catholic Armenian population were ordered at the expiration of fifteen days to depart from the city and take up their quarters in the neighbouring villages. Death was denounced as the penalty of harbouring a Roman Catholic Armenian. The Porte declared that it recognized only one Armenian religion in the Turkish empire, and one Armenian Patriarch of the orthodox church. All separatists were denounced as schismatics, and threatened with the direst penalties if they did not return to the true Patriarchal Church.

So much for the much-vaunted spirit of toleration of the Turkish Government.

In the beginning of 1828 a new panic seized on the Turkish population of Constantinople. The Sultan, the officers of State, soldiers, mufti, ulemas, imaums, dervishes, all were infected with an epidemic terror and raging frenzy of rabid fanaticism. The recently received news of the destruction of The Turkish and Egyptian fleets at Navarino, by the English, French, and Russians had caused this new explosion of rage and alarm, venting their fury in cries of vengeance on the Giaours, death to the rayahs, and wild denunciation against the

whole Christian community, who were waiting, it is supposed, the arrival of the hostile fleets from Navarino to massacre the Osmalis. The panic and its accompanying denunciations quickly spread far and wide, even to the most distant parts of Syria. News of the prevailing agitation reached Jerusalem while I was there, but timely notice of the dangers to which all Christians were exposed, enabled me to get clear by a precipitate journey overland to Sidon, where I was fortunate enough to find an English vessel about to sail for Egypt.*

When the panic and the persecution of 1827-1828 terminated, then came the customary phase of diplomatic interference at the Porte, of complaints, protests, remonstrances, and menaces, always following close on the heels of Turkish outrages on its Christian subjects. On this occasion they came from the French embassy at Constantinople. The Ambassador of the French Sovereign, the Count Guilleminot, proceeded with such energy, and asserted with such a high hand the right of his sovereign to assume the character of protector of the Roman Catholic Church and its members in the Ottoman Dominions, that all the severe measures of the government against the Roman Catholic Armenians were rescinded, and in 1829 measures of protection, privileges, and immunities which they never had before were demanded imperatively, and extorted at length from the reluctant Porte. A Patriarch of their community, to be appointed by the Vatican, was recognized as the head of the religion of the Roman Catholic Armenians in Turkey.

The Ambassador did not limit his demand for the protection, "the full and entire emancipation" of the Armenians in communion with the Church of Rome, he claimed the same for all other Christians of the Roman Catholic subjects, specifying particularly the Maronites, Melkites, and Chaldean-Syrians, demanding for the three Roman Catholic communities just

* Vitans Charybdim incidit in Scyllam. It was my fate on this occasion in flying from the Turks to fall into the hands of Greek pirates.

mentioned, the privilege of having separate religious chiefs, recognised by the Roman Catholic Church. The Porte at first insisted on guaranteeing the spiritual independence of those communities under the protection of a Mussulman civil chief, or Nazir; but the ambassador's renewed demands soon led to the Nazir being replaced by a bishop, and eventually by a Patriarch. Thus, in 1829, while the Roman Catholic Irish Rajahs of the British Empire were being emancipated, the Roman Catholic "dogs of Christians" in the Turkish Empire, were likewise walking out of their chains.

The Armenian community no sooner got their Patriarch an institution, than they found the greatest possible difficulty. The result of this embarrassment was a new persecution of the old enemy, the Turkish Porte, and a new arrangement—separation of the temporal and spiritual authorities, the former, or rather the administrative part of it, to be exercised by a Patriarch elected by the community, the latter by a Primate appointed by the Pope. It is hardly necessary to add, the two authorities were no sooner constituted than they clashed; each protested against the encroachments of the other, and affairs were becoming seriously embroiled, verging on a religious war, when the contest was happily ended by a compromise. A deliberative voice in the council was conceded to the Primate, and the Patriarchal attributes were divided into three parts, and confided respectively to the Patriarch, to the Primate, and the President of the council. Separate functions were likewise given to magistrates, at whose tribunals civil and criminal causes of minor importance, and common disputes *inter se* were tried; others of more importance were reserved for arbitration by another tribunal, and in a short time the reputation of these Roman Catholic tribunals became so great for fairness and justice, that the Rayahs of other communities, and even Mussulmans, in their differences with Catholics, voluntarily had recourse to them.

The Roman Catholic Armenian community included in its Protectorate the small Roman Catholic communities called

Aleppans, Melkites, Syrians, and Chaldeans, and certainly the protection afforded to them, and the influence exerted for them in common with all Roman Catholics included in the United Armenian community, by the French ambassador at Constantinople, left them no reasonable ground of complaint. The Aleppans, however, got tired of the protection of the community, and declared their determination, that rather than endure it, they would place themselves under the Greek or the Armenian Patriarch. They appealed to Rome, and also to Austria, who at this time began to take a tender interest in the welfare of Syrian Roman Catholics, who had hitherto owed their protection to French influence in those countries. The appeal to Austria, in all probability, had led to a decree of the Porte, in virtue of which, the Alleppans were separated from the Roman Catholic Armenian community, replaced in the class of Latin rajahssi, with a Turkish functionary at their head; this *privilege*, and also that of having an official seal of their own, as a distinct religious body, was demanded and obtained for them by Austria, that tender, loving mother of Roman Catholic Christianity in Syria when French influence was to be undermined by the new mission it had given itself, in the same way that it had been patronised and encumbered with its protection in Italy, whose liberty was to be assailed under the mask of its support.

The success of Austria on behalf of its Aleppan protegés was productive of great mischief to the Roman Catholic Armenian community. It led to intrigues, dissensions, jealousies, and exposure in short, of Roman Catholics throughout Syria, to renewed attacks, both open and secret, and of increased violence on the part of their enemies. In this state of things the Roman Catholic community suffered considerably, both in influence and number, and at the very period when wise and prudent measures, and large views, and a conciliatory spirit were particularly necessary in the government of its affairs, the course pursued towards this community by the congregation of the Propaganda in Rome, was by no means calculated to retrieve

its affairs by restoring peace, concord, and union. The old dissensions between the Mechitarists and Propagandists broke out afresh, and only five years ago threatened the extinction of the Roman Catholic Armenian community.

The Armenian Primatial Church of Constantinople is first made mention of in the year 1307. Many privileges were conferred on this Archbishopric by the Sultan Mohammed the II., and also on the Patriarch. The Archbishop used the title Patriarch as an honorary distinction, but never usurped the functions. The number of Armenian dioceses is thirty six, besides many monasteries, which are called bishoprics. The election of the bishops and of all the Armenian clergy is made by universal suffrage. When a church requires a bishop the clergy send a deputation or petition to the Patriarch at Constantinople with a list of the candidates thus elected, setting forth the merits of each. The Patriarch, assisted by its council, makes a choice. The newly elected bishop is then summoned to Constantinople, where he is examined rigorously, after which his competency for his functions being ascertained, his nomition takes place.

The ecclesiastical hierarchy of the United Armenian community (in connexion with the Church of Rome), consists of 1st, a Patriarch; 2nd, a Primate of Constantinople; 3rd, the Bishops; 4th, the Clergy, secular and monastic. The Patriarch styled of Cilicia, whose seat was formerly at Sis, in Cilicia, now resides in the Lebanon, at Bezaummar, he had two archbishops in partibus, and the Bishops of Aleppo Merdin and Amasia Tokat as suffrigans. In 1830 the primatial seat of Constantinople was made entirely independent of the Patriarch of Cilicia and of the Porte. All the expenses of the primatial see are provided for by the Propaganda of Rome, and the society for the propagation of the faith. The contribution of the latter towards the primatial see at Constantinople for some years past has averaged a thousand a year. The mode of electing the Roman Catholic Primate above referred to, whose primatial seat is at Constantinople, was for the Roman Ca-

tholic Armenian community to send the names of three candidates of different degrees of worthiness but all deemed fit for the vacant office, and one of the three recommended by the community was to be selected, and was invariably appointed, by it.

We now are in a position to form an opinion of the circumstances which have brought the Roman Catholic Armenian community into controversies, dissensions, and jealousies, that have menaced it with schism and extinction.

In 1845, on the death of the Primate Marusci, Monsignore Hassoun was appointed by the Vatican without reference of any sort to the patriarch, or primate, or prelates of the Roman Catholic Armenian community. There was no participation of the national church or community in this appointment. On the notification of this appointment being received by the community, displeasure, and even indignation were loudly expressed at this departure from an ancient usage, an innovation which they alleged violated the rights of their hierarchy, and gave serious uneasiness to the minds of the community at large.

"The Primate of Cilicia being at Rome (says Ubicini) took upon himself, without consulting the authorities of his own country, or even acquainting them with his intentions, to obtain from Pius IX., a pastoral letter, erecting the cities of Broussa, Angora, Trebizond, Erzeroum, and Artwin into bishoprics, and appointing five prelates chosen by himself and the See of Rome to fill them. The United Armenian community resented, not unnaturally, this ecclesiastical encroachment, and though consenting to recognize the institution of the five new bishoprics—notwithstanding the necessity for them was not very apparent—refused to confirm the nomination of the individuals selected to be the new bishops, on the ground of the irregularity of their appointment: while the Porte, which had kept aloof from the dispute concerning the election of the primate, now intervened, as its own prerogatives were virtually attacked. It must be remembered that provin-

cial bishops of the United Armenian church enjoy a civil power not possessed by their primate at Constantinople, and that the pretension of the Papal See would have enabled it to create an authority over a certain portion of the Sultan's subjects wholly foreign to and uncontrolled by the Porte itself."*

The Court of Rome replied to these remonstrances, justifying their own course on the grounds of its being calculated to secure the independence of the United Armenian church, refusing to accede to the wishes of the remonstrants, and asserting that the procedure complained of was based on a principle which could not be departed from.

The contested election was then brought before a council of the community, and a programme was laid down setting forth the various forms and formulas necessary to be adopted on all occasions of a necessity having arisen to elect a primate. One of the principal articles of this plan of election (the 25th) was based on an ancient regulation, requiring that the primate should be nominated from a list of three candidates chosen and recommended by the community, and in case of refusal of the court of Rome to elect one of these persons that a protest should be made against the nomination.

When this article came to be discussed, scenes of unparalleled violence in the United Armenian council ensued, those who were opposed to the violation of the ancient usage of their church were of dubious orthodoxy—Mechitarists—those who were in favour of the abolition of all national rights and privileges were Propagandists of indisputable orthodoxy. The community was torn to pieces in the strife of a controversy that ought never to have been caused.

What did it matter to Roman Catholic interests in the East or in the West that an Italian ecclesiastic was more or less lucratively provided for? But it did matter prodigiously to the interests of the Roman Catholic religion in the East that the ancient usages of a church in common with it should not be

* See "Lettres sur la Turquie."

ignored, infringed, abolished. The court of Rome, for the interests of the Catholic Church either in the East or in the West, should never have been composed exclusively of ecclesiastical dignitaries of one nation, nor of several Italian provinces ruled with a rod of iron by the Austrian empire.

I can very well understand at particular junctures or in emergencies of life or death, importance to the interests of religion, with a view to the prevention of the terrible evils of a schism or a heresy, that it might be prudent, nay absolutely imperative on the Court of Rome to supersede for that emergency an ancient right and privilege of a church, and to exercise its own superior authority even with a high hand, in nominating a primate or other prelate to a see solely and essentially with a view to its interests and for that occasion holding in abeyance an ancient and legitimate usage which provided for that nomination in a different manner. But if no such crisis or emergency existed, if the results of an innovation like that which I allude to were not calculated to promote the spiritual interests of the community affected by it, nor at all likely to be permanently advantageous to them, then the question of the expediency or prudence of that innovation must appear to historical inquiry extremely doubtful. The question brought to an issue by this contest of 1845 was fraught with evil to the Roman Catholic Armenian community; public attention was withdrawn from all secular concerns and bestowed entirely on polemics; the administration of its affairs was neglected; and a debt of small amount was increased to a million of piastres. Affairs remained in this state till 1851, when the Roman Catholic Primate of Cilicia being at Rome took upon himself, without consulting the ecclesiastical authorities, to obtain from the court of Rome the creation of the several new bishoprics, and the appointment of the five prelates to sees created in Broussa, Angora, Trebizond, Erzeroum, and Artwin. The contests and controversies thus excited, raged for a long time, but eventually the Roman Catholic community to avoid a schism recognized the nomination of the new bishop,

reserving to itself its national right of recommendation of candidates on the occurrence of the next vacancy.

I am not ignorant of some valid reasons which might be adduced under existing circumstances for the innovation I have just referred to, practised in the Roman Catholic Armenian community with respect to the ordination of priests, the selection of persons recommended for appointment to Bishoprics, and the difficulties connected with the marriage state of ecclesiastics of the Eastern churches, recognized though it be by the Holy See, not only at variance with its discipline, but productive of discord in several of the Eastern churches. But it is very doubtful to me if these reasons would be valid if other means had been adopted for improving the status of the Roman Catholic Armenian community, besides interfering with an old established national privilege of vast importance in the minds of all its followers.

If the See of Rome were to issue a rescript forbidding ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic Armenian church to marry, the consequences in all probability would be fatal to that community, their resistance to it would be far greater than to any interference with the rights of ecclesiastics in relation to the nomination of Bishops. And yet although marriage is permitted to the priests of the United Armenian Church as in the case of other Eastern churches in communion with the Holy See, few avail themselves of the permission, and those who do are chiefly priests of the diocese of Erzeroum and Artwin, and their number is diminishing considerably. If any violent measures had been adopted to attain this result, they would not only have failed, but have made these marriages more frequent.

And now at the conclusion of this subject, a few words remain to be spoken plainly and truthfully, without regard to their bearing on any passing events, prevailing fashions of opinion, or any interests save those which are not "of an age but for all time." The opinions on most subjects of a person in his individual capacity of no eminence or influence on account

of exalted talents or position in society, are of little value or importance outside the little circle of his own immediate friends. But the opinions of an author who treats even incidentally of religious interests are so far of importance to his readers, that it is desirable for them to know what his religious principles are and the church of which he professes to be a member. Without that knowledge they will not well know what value to set either on his opinions or his statement of facts. With this conviction I venture, or rather I take courage to avow, that being a member of the Roman Catholic church, in all sincerity believing implicitly in its divine origin, mission, and destiny, that no vicissitudes of fortune, faithlessness of rulers, or fury of enemies can affect its stability, whether the seat of its spiritual empire be in Rome, Avignon, Vienna, Madrid, an Island of the Mediterranean, or in that Holy Land out of which it came, or any region of Christendom no matter how poor and circumscribed. The Court of Rome, as it has been for ages constituted, is not in my opinion essential to the spiritual life of the Catholic religion in the East, nor even advantageous to it. I cannot help thinking that the principal schisms in the church, some of which I have had to refer to in the preceding pages, although under any circumstances they might have occurred, would not have endured as they have done for centuries, if the Church of Rome alone, without the encumbrance of a Court, had to deal with them.

CHAPTER VI.

The Maronites.

THERE is great confusion about the founder of the Maronite community. There are no less than two or three saintly personages of antiquity made mention of in Syrian ecclesiastical history, of the name of Maro, or Maroun.

I find an account of one of these holy personages named Jean Maroun, in the "Essai de la Histoire Monastique de l'Orient," by the learned Benedictine of St. Maur. (Paris: 1680. pag. 338 and 348).

"Saint Maron established himself on the top of a mountain, which had been prophaned by the worship of idols, and, having consecrated to the living God, the temple he found there, he made use of it for the purpose of prayer. He built a cell near it, to which, however, he seldom retired; and in order to do penance, he generally lived in the open air. He founded several monasteries, and amongst the number, one in the territory of Cyr. He was equally a physician of body and of soul, having performed many miracles in restoring the sick to health, and converted numbers of persons by his holy instructions. He was greatly honoured by the faithful after his death. There was much dispute as to who should possess his relics, and those who carried them away, built over his tomb a large church, where, from that time they celebrated his festival. This church was probably the same as the monastery of St. Maron, of which we have already spoken." . . .

The two principal monasteries of Nicerte, in the second Syria are those of St. Maron and that of Jugat. It is very probable that the monastery of St. Maron was near the church where reposed the relics of this holy Abbot. For we know from Procopius that this church was in the diocese of Apamee, metropolitan church of the second Syria. It is certain that this monastery of St. Maron, held the second rank amongst all the monasteries of this province. The period which the above notice refers to is the early part of the fifth century.

The Maronite Saint, Maron, as described by M. Guys, in his work, "Beyrout et le Liban," and also by Ubicini, is a different person. He figures therein as the holy Patriarch, John Maro, or Maroun, who flourished towards the middle of the 7th century, and was made Bishop of Botrys, at the foot of the Lebanon. He rendered himself celebrated by his writings, against Nestorius, obtained the dignity of Patriarch of the Mountain, and fixed his residence at the monastery of Canobin, in the valley of Tripoli, founded by Theodosius the Great.

An historical document, a letter of St. James, the Syrian, the disciple of the holy Abbot Maron, ce Saint Abbé, as the learned Benedictine of St. Maur, styles him (Histoire Monastique del Orient, p. 348), addressed to the Emperor Leon, dated 458, is found appended to the acts of the Council of Chalcedon, which was convoked in 451, wherein he declares that the true faith is that which is laid down in the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon (Hist. Mon. p. 568). This document is conclusive evidence of the decease of the Abbé, prior to 458, for the disciple, James, the Syrian, is said to have surpassed his master, Saint Maron, in the austerity of his penitential life.

No mention is made in the Histoire Monastique of any other Maron, saint, abbé, or Patriarch; therefore I presume this St. Maron of the fifth century, is the patron of the Maronites, and believe M. Ubicini, and several other writers who have treated of the Maronites, have made a mistake of three centuries in assigning him to the 8th.

The Maronites, from the time of the venerable Abbot or Pa-

triarch, Maro, or Maroun, were settled chiefly in the mountains of Tripoli, and many families likewise in the valley at the foot of the Lebanon, where the monastery of Canobin was founded by the Emperor Theodosius, and in the 7th century, in the midst even of all the ravages of the Saracens, preserved their independence, not only in religion, but their liberty and their mountain territory for a long time unmolested. Eventually they were harassed alike by Saracens and Turks, persecuted as *maradaites* (rebels against authority), and must have been exterminated, but for the intervention of the French Sovereign in 1659, who took *the Maronite Patriarch with all his prelates* under his protection, and instructed his ambassador at the Porte to remonstrate against the barbarous outrages that had been inflicted on them. This interposition saved the Maronite community; but considerable numbers of them, during, and subsequent to, the persecution they suffered, removed from their old settlements, and established themselves in other regions of the Lebanon.

Let us examine the claims or pretensions on which this intervention was grounded.

The Maronites from the time of the Crusades have claimed, and been accorded, a special protection at the hands of the sovereigns of France.

So early as the 13th century a sovereign of France claimed for the Maronites in Syria the same protection that French subjects enjoyed in their own country. In a letter addressed "To the Prince, the Patriarch, and Bishops of the Maronites," St. Louis said:—

"Nous sommes persuadés que cette nation, que nous trouvons établie sous le nom de Saint-Maroun est une partie de la nation Française, car son amitié pour les Français ressemble à l'amitié que les Français se portent entre eux. En conséquence, il est juste que vous et tous les Maronites jouissent de la même protection dont les Français jouissent près de nous, et que vous soyez admis dans les emplois comme ils le sont eux-mêmes.

"Quant à nous et à tous ceux qui nous succéderont sur le trône de France, nous vous promettons de vous donner, à vous et à votre peuple, protection comme aux Français eux-mèmes et de faire constamment ce qui sera nécessaire à votre bonheur."

But a century and a half previously the Maronites had fought in the ranks of the crusades of France under Godfrey de Bouillon, and when the Christians were established in Jerusalem and Godfrey de Bouillon was sovereign of the new Christian State, the French contracted closer ties of amity with their Maronite allies, than those in which they engaged against their common enemy, the Turks. Inter-marriages took place, and the children of French chevaliers and Maronite women born in Jerusalem and other strongholds and towns held by the Christians were considered as of French origin and entitled to the same rights and privileges.

The author of "Les Maronites et la France," adverting to to the early relations between the French and Maronites, says:—

"Des mariages avaient mêlé leur sang au nôtre, et ils avaient vécu sous la suzeraineté des rois Français de Jerusalem.

"Le malheur ajouta de nouveaux titres à ceux qu'ils possédaient déjà. Les infidéles, envahissant peu à peu les derniers lambeaux du royaume de Jérusalem, ne s'arrêtérent qu'au pied du Liban; les derniers croisés Français vinrent s'y réfugier chez leurs frères les Maronites."

The claims of the Maronites and the concessions made to them in virtue of the patronage of the French sovereigns are embodied in the first capitulation which Francis the I. obtained for them from Sultan Solomon in 1553, which serves as the basis of all stipulations, political and commercial, not only on the part of France, but of the other great European powers with the Ottoman sovereigns. But in this particular treaty of 1553, Francis the I. caused a proviso to be inserted, of a then exceptional kind, which guaranteed to the Latin community of

the Convent of Jerusalem the possession of the Sanctuaries or "holy places" usually visited by pilgrims, which were then in their hands, and had been so (as the treaty set forth) "ab antiquo," without designating however these holy places.

"Les religieux francs qui, suivant l'ancienne coutume, sont établis dedans et dehors de la ville de Jérusalem, dans l'église du Saint-Sépulcre appelée *Kamama*, ne seront point inquiétés pour les lieux de visitation qu'ils habitent et qui sont entre leurs mains, lesquels resteront encore entre leurs mains comme par ci-devant, sans qu'ils puissent être inquiétés à cet égard, non plus que par des prétentions d'impositions; et, s'il leur survenait quelque procès qui ne pût être décidé sur les lieux, il sera renvoyé à ma Sublime Porte." *(Capitulations*, art. 33.)*

The demands urged by the French Government on the Ottoman Porte in 1851, in relation to the "Lieux Saints," were based upon an official Turkish document, or Berat, denominated by the French *diplome*, obtained by the Maronites in 1690 from the Porte and renewed at various intervals in 1695, 1703, 1731 and 1755, which has been made the basis of all the reclamations of France either on behalf of the Latin Christians in relation to the holy places, or of the Rayahs in Syria, professing the Roman Catholic religion. The text of this Berat is deserving of attention.†

* La Question D'Orient devant l'Europe Documents officielles, &c., sur la Question des Lieux Saints Annotes. Par M. A. Ubicini, auteur des Lettres sur la Turquie. Par. 1854.

† *Berat de* 1101 (1690 *de J. C.*).

"Des différends s'étant élevés à Jérusalem entre les religieux francs, porteurs du présent berat impérial, et les Grecs, au sujet de quelques lieux qu'ils regardent comme lieux de visitation, un sublime firman avait été rendu du temps de notre prédecesseur, ordonnant une enquête. L'on s'était, en conséquence, transporté sur les lieux, et des *houdjet* et des *arzimahzar* avaient été dressés, contenant les déclarations suivantes, faites en présence des deux parties: (les religieux francs possédaient) le droit d'orner le lieu qu'ils regardent comme le tombeau de Jésus-Christ,—que sur lui soit le salut!—situé au milieu de l'église du Saint-Sépulcre, et d'y tendre des tapis, les deux coupoles en plomb, grande et petit, qui recouvrent le tombeau, le droit de desservir le dedans et le dehors du tombeau, et la place au milieu de laquelle il se trouve; d'y dire la messe et d'y placer des flambeaux, d'orner de tentures le petit autel situé entre la place en face de la porte du tombeau et la grille de fer qui sert de limite à l'église grecque...; la moitié du cal-

Certain Greeks, as it was asserted by the Latins, about twelve years ago, had carried away, from the Grotto of the Nativity at Bethlehem, an offering of great value, of silver, adorned with precious stones, the star which had marked the place from time immemorial where it is alleged our Saviour was born, and of so much celebrity subsequently in diplomatic circles, as the subject and cause of that controversy which terminated in the late Russian war.

It must be borne in mind that in 1740, a new capitulation was obtained by the then French sovereign from the Sultan Mahmoud the first, repealing the ancient claims of the first treaty relative to the holy places, ratifying them anew, but still without designating the sanctuaries recognised as being in the possession of the Latins, and under the protection of the French sovereign. This omission gave rise to frequent feuds and contests between the Greeks and Latins of the Holy Land, which the Porte was continually called on to settle, and affected to do by ambiguous firmans, and contradictory decisions of the legal tribunal, the Mehkeme. The second treaty or capitulation between the French Republic and

vaire, qu'ils appellent le lieu de la crucifixion; le droit d'avoir le pas sur les autres nations dans les visitations; celui d'exercer leur culte dans le bas et le haut des sept arcades dites de Sainte-Marie, ainsi que sur la pierre de l'onction. Les Grecs s'opposent à l'exercice de ces droits par prépotence; ils ont enlevé les cierges des lieux où ils étaient.

"A Bethleem, la clef de la grande église, celles des portes de la grotte où êst né Jesus-Christ, dans la miême église, en tout trois clefs appartenant exclusivement aux Religieux francs. Nous avons vu et érifié toutes ces choses; un grand nombre de musulmans, incapables de rendre un faux témoignage, se sont présentés devant le tribunal de la loi, et ont déclaré que les lieux objet de la contestation ont été laissés depuis les temps anciens entre les mains des Religieux francs, mais que les Grecs les possêdent depuis quelques années, *par suite de leurs fausses declarations.*

"Vu le firman donné aux Religieux francs en 1045 (1635 de J. C.), sous le Sultan Mourad, en vertu et par la considération que le titre que leurs adversaires prétendaient tenir du chef des vrais croyans, Omar, fils de Khattab, *était dénué fondement, faux controuvé.*

"Vu les houdjet juridiques que les Religieux francs ont aujourd'hui entre les mains.

"Nous ordonnons que les susaits lieux, qui anciennement êtaient exclusivement affectés et attribues aux religieux francs, soient confirmés entre leurs mains de la même manière qu'ils y étaient.

the Porte, of June, 1803, confirms all former concessions or immunities to French Governors guaranteed by the Porte.

The contentions consequent between the Latins and Greeks of Palestine, on the vagueness of the treaties previously referred to, with respect to the particular sanctuaries, the custody of which was guaranteed to the Latins, continued down to 1847.

Of the various possessions of the Latins and privileges with regard to custody of sanctuaries in 1847, the Greeks had deprived them of all but six. This was the occasion of a note to the Divan from the French ambassador at Constantinople, in 1851.

It was not forgotten by the French Government of that day, in their instructions to the Ambassador, that Napoleon, under the walls of St. Jean D'Acre, had recognised the claims of the Maronites to French protection. "Je reconnais que les Maronites sont Français de temps immémorial."

The Ambassador was reminded that a treaty of commerce between France and the Ottoman Porte had been entered into in November, 1838. By the first article of that treaty, all the former privileges and immunities accorded by the Porte in virtue of former treaties, were guaranteed.

These lieux saints, or "holy places," are certain churches, sanctuaries, shrines, and sepulchres, in and around Jerusalem, either the sites or the structures of which have been renowned and venerated from the earliest ages of Christianity.

In the works of the old travellers in the East, from the latter part of the seventeenth century, we find many references to the Maronites, generally speaking, favourable to the character of this people, and many references also in the works of modern English travellers, of a similar kind. But of late it is to be regretted that our consuls and missionaries have taken it into their heads that the politics and polemics of their nation are to be promoted by disparaging the Roman Catholic Maronites, and setting up the half Pagan, half Mussulman Druses as their superiors in all respects, mental, moral, physical, and spiritual.

The Maronite Patriarch named by the bishops of his Church, and confirmed by the Pope, has under his jurisdiction seven suffragan sees, namely Saida, Beyrout, Damascus, Balbek, Tripoli, Aleppo, and Cyprus. The ordinary clergy is composed of twelve hundred priests, who serve nearly four hundred churches. The number of convents for monks is sixty-seven, and of those for nuns, fifteen.

The Patriarch of the Maronites formerly exercised very extensive powers not only of a religious but of a civil kind, for the protection of his people, who, in those times possessed many important immunities and franchises, which, since 1842, have been either abrogated or assimilated to the privileges enjoyed by other Roman Catholic subjects of the Porte. But the Maronites still, in all great emergencies and dangers, at the hands of their old and constant enemies, the Druses, are wont to look to their Patriarch rather than to the Emir, their nominal civil protector, for counsel and guidance. The Patriarch in the winter, resides ordinarily at Kesrouan, and in the summer at the monastery Canobin, in the valley of Tripoli, supposed to be, on very insufficient grounds, where the venerated Maro had fixed his abode.

The doctrines of the Maronite community are, of course, those of the Latin Church, but their ritual and liturgy differ in many respects from those of the latter. The mass is recited in the Syriac language, with the exception of the Epistle and Gospel, and some prayers, which are recited in Arabic, the only language understood by the people, the Syriac being used only in the services of the Church, and the offices of the priests. The secular clergy are allowed to marry by special permission of the Holy See, which indulgence is extended likewise to the clergy of other Eastern Churches united to Rome, with the exception of the Latin.

The Maronites now, or rather previously to the late massacres, did occupy the valley and fastnesses of the principal Lebanon ridge, East of Beyrout and Tripoli, extending inland to the Bekaa, the plain between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon.

They numbered before the late massacres, about two hundred thousand souls.

The protegées of our British Consuls and missionaries, the Druses, were in all respects inferior to them in intelligence, industrious habits, morals, and personal appearance. I have rarely seen a finer looking peasantry, or known a more hospitable, frugal, honest, or more laborious people. The cultivated grounds of theirs—plantations of cotton and olives, fields of corn, and mulberry grounds, and vineyards—in some districts, especially in Kesrouan, exceeded in extent, and the evidence they bore to the industrious habits of the Maronites, all other cultivated grounds I have seen, either in Syria, or in any other portion of the Turkish Empire.

The numbers of the Maronite community dwelling in Lebanon and scattered over various parts of Syria are estimated by several writers at a higher amount than that set down by Ubicini, in fact, the estimates before the late massacres varied from 140,000 to 200,000.

The number of them actually slain in the late massacres, certainly amounted to 8,000.

The number of wounded who have since died, cannot be estimated at less than 2,000.

The number of members scattered during the massacres, or who fled from their homes to the adjacent islands, or to other provinces may be estimated at 20,000.

So that the population of Syria may be estimated at this date, as having been reduced, by the late massacres, and the consequences of them to the extent of 30,000, at the very lowest computation.

CHAPTER VII.

The Order of the Assassins of Persia and Syria, of the 11th and 12th centuries, and the derivation from them of the existing secret sects of Syria.

THE modern Druses, according to some authors, the Ansayrii, according to others, derive their origin from the Assassins of Syria of the olden time.

It is a curious circumstance that both Druses and Ansayrii, though now at least distinct sects, separated locally, socially, and polemically, so hostile to each other as to be occasionally engaged in deadly warfare (the Hon. Mr. Walpole had ample experience of that fact), in the fundamental tenets and principal rites of their religions, have many leading doctrines, and observances, and prejudices in common. Their creeds are a jumble of Mohammedanism of the Shiite sect of votaries of Ali, of Magianism, of Paganism, and a slight admixture of Nestorian and Pelagian Christianity. They both hold Ali in the highest veneration, their respect amounting almost to idolatry. Next in honour they have the great revealed Imaam, the Lord Hakeim. They profess to believe in the Metempsychosis. Some of them practise circumcision, not as an obligatory rite, but rather as an ancient custom, that has something holy and wholesome in it. They manifest alike the greatest possible anxiety to keep their religious tenets and rites secret. They both have degrees of initiation in their mysteries. They are bound by oath, or vows of the most solemn kind to keep

strangers from a knowledge of their religion. They both isolate themselves alike from Mussulmans and Christians, and abstain from the same kinds of food. They both carry hypocrisy to a greater pitch than the followers of any other religion. They loathe and detest Mohammedanism, yet in the company of influential Moslems they fast and pray like the disciples of Mohammed; and in Turkish towns where they are known, they frequent the mosques, and affect to be mussulman devotees. They both hold Christians in contempt and even hatred, yet to them they profess feelings of the highest respect, and sentiments of the most tolerant description for their religion. Nay, they profess to be half Christians, and some even go much farther. Yet in any persecution against the Christian Rayah of the Lebanon or Anti-Lebanon, on the part of fanatic Mohammedans, they side with the latter, and often secretly conspire with their representatives and agents, the Dervishes of the provinces, against their Christian neighbours, on religious pretexts, for the purposes of rapine and domination. They both certainly have a secret religion, if it can be so called, or an institution organised in a spirit of profound hypocrisy, a machinery of secret rites, secret prayers, secret oaths, or vows, for the accomplishment of their objects and interests of their several sects. Arrogant and specious pretexts to great zeal for religion, and strong tendencies to spoil and plunder those who are not of their faith. And in all these respects they both have striking analogies with the ancient secret sect or order of the Assassins.

In Europe there has been only one secret society, composed of fanatics and marauders animated by similar instincts, a fierce detestation of neighbouring people of a different religion, an irresistible desire to trample on them, to spoil and slay them in the name of religion—the secret institution of Irish Orangeism.

The reader who peruses the following outline of the ancient order of Assassins, and accounts of the Druses and the Ansayrii, and the religious tenets and observances of both, certainly the most complete of all authentic descriptions of them, will be able

to determine which of the two sects and tribes of the Ansayrii and Druses have the most *rapport* with the older secret order of the Assassins.

"After the time of Mohammed (says Sale), Arabia was, for about three centuries, under the caliphs, his successors, But in the year 325 of the Hegira, great part of that country was in the hands of the Karmatians, a new sect, who had committed great outrages and disorders even in Mecca, and to whom the caliphs were obliged to pay tribute, that the pilgrimage thither might be performed.

"The Karmatians, a sect which bore an inveterate malice against the Mohammedans, began first to raise disturbances in the year of the Hegira 278, and the latter end of the reign of Mohammed. Their origin is not well known, but the common tradition is, that a poor fellow whose name some call Karmala, came from Kuzistan, to the villages near Cufa, and there feigned great sanctity and strictness of life, and that God had enjoined him to pray fifty times a day, pretending also to invite people to the obedience of a certain Imàm, of the family of Mohammed.

[Having suffered persecution and imprisonment at the hands of the Governor of the Province, he contrived to effect his escape, his adherents giving out that God had taken him into Heaven.]

"Afterwards (continues Sale), he appeared in another province, and declared to a great number of people he had got about him, that it was not in the power of any to do him hurt, notwithstanding which, his courage failed him, he retired into Syria, and was not heard of any more. His sect, however, continued and increased, pretending that their master had manifested himself to be a true prophet, and had left them a new law, wherein he had changed the ceremonies and forms of prayer used by the moslems, and introduced a new kind of fast; and that he allowed them to drink wine, and dispensed with several things commanded in the Koran. They also turned the precepts of that book into allegory; teaching that prayer was

the symbol of their obedience to their Imam, and fasting that of silence, or concealing their dogmas from strangers. They also believed fornication to be the sin of infidelity; and the guilt thereof to be incurred by those who revealed the mysteries of their religion, or paid not a blind obedience to their chief. They are said to have produced a book, wherein was written (among other things), 'In the name of the most merciful God: Al Faraj Ebn Othman, of the town of Nesrana, saith, that Christ appeared unto him in a human form, and said, "Thou art the invitation; thou art the demonstration; thou art the camel; thou art the beast; thou art John, the son of Zacharias; thou art the Holy Ghost.' From the year above-mentioned the Karmatians, under several leaders, gave almost continual disturbance to the caliphs, and other Mohammedan subjects for several years; committing great disorders and outrages in Chaldea, Arabia, Syria, and Mesopotamia, and at length establishing a considerable principality, the power whereof was in its meridian in the reign of Abu Dhâher, famous for his taking of Mecca, the indignities by him offered to the temple there, but which declined soon after his time, and came to nothing.

"To the Karmatians the Ismaelians of Asia were very near of kin, if they were not a branch of them. For these, who were also called al Molâhedah, or the Impious, and by the writers of the holy wars, Assassins, agreed with the former in many respects; such as their inveterate malice against those of other religions, and especially the Mohammedan; their unlimited obedience to their prince, at whose command they were ready for assassinations, or any other bloody and dangerous enterprise, their pretended attachment to a certain Imâm of the house of Ali, &c. These Ismaelians, in the year 483, possessed themselve of al Jebâl, in the Persian Irâk, under the conduct of Hasan Sabah, and that prince and his descendants enjoyed the same for an hundred and seventy-one years, till the whole race of them was destroyed by Holagu, the Tartar."*

* Sale's Koran. Preliminary Discourse.

The History of the Assassins, by J. Von Hammer (translated from the German, by Dr. Wood. Lon. 1335), presents the only extant detailed authentic account of this singular confederacy, taken from Oriental sources, in any European language.

Von Hammer tells us the Assassins are but a branch of the Ismaelites, and these latter, not the Arabs generally as descendants of Ishmael, the son of Hagar, but a sect existing in the bosom of Islamism, and so called from Ismael, the son of Jafer.

A very short time after the death of Mohammed, his religion was split into seventy-two sects. Of these the two divisions of the Sonnites and Schiites, concern the history of the Assassins. Their main differences consisted in these matters of dissidence. The Sonnites (orthodox Moslems) recognised as legitimate the four first caliphs. The Schiites acknowledged only the legitimacy of Ali and his descendants. The former anathematise the murderers of the third caliph, Osman, the latter pour maledictions on the slayers of Ali and his sons. Generally speaking, what one execrates the other venerates, what one receives as divine in its origin, the other rejects as diabolical in its essence.

They received also the name of Mulhad (the Impious). The basis of their doctrine was on an idolatrous reverence for, and a deification of the first Imaams, notwithstanding that the latter rejected this doctrine, and contemned its supporters. Ali himself doomed some of the Ghullats to the flames to purge their doctrine of course and improve their theology. The Imaam Jafer excommunicated all who ascribed Godlike properties to the Imaams. The ghullat attributed all this opposition to their leading doctrine to modesty on the part of the Imaams. They went on teaching the same tenets, "gaining both teachers and disciples."

The great danger of their doctrine was, that it enticed an uncivilised people, always lovers of what is vague and mysterious in religious rites and dogmas, taught the ignorant multitude to be seditious, made them easily dupes of religious impostors,

instruments of their ambition, by turning the obedience of the people from a visible and imperfect prince, to an invisible and perfect Imaam.

The famous Shah Nadir endeavoured to effect a union between the hostile sects, but his efforts were as fruitless as those of the Roman Pontiffs to unite the Eastern and Western Churches.

The grand question which separates the two main divisions of sects, is that of succession in the Imaamat office of high priest and ruler, or right to the supreme pontificate in the family of Ali, claimed for his descendants.

The great sect of the Schiites, called Seidyee, hold that the office of Imaam descends from Ali to his sons, Hassan and Hossein, whereas other sects believe that Seid's brother, Mohammed Bekr, was the legitimate Imaam.

Another sect of the Schiites, the Hassan-ye, contend that the Imaam remained in the person of Mohammed, and never was transferred to any other person, he (Mohammed) never having died, but only disappeared for a time, and again appeared at various intervals under other names.

Another sect of the Schiites, the Ghullat (the extravagant), propound wild opinions, in which traces of the metaphysics of the Gnostics, and the mysteries of Indian forms of religion were to be found. Some recognised but one Imaam alone, others, a succession of them, and attribute divine qualities to Ali. They believed in the doctrine of metempsychosis; some of them that the Imaams alone are privileged to enjoy this successive transposition and transformation. Some hold that the succession of the Imaams was interrupted by Mohammed Bekr, the brother of Seid, believed to be still alive, a wanderer over the earth, concealed, like Khiser, the guardian of the spring of life. Others hold that Ali alone exists but in the clouds, enthroned there for all time, whose voice is heard in the thunder, whilst his wrath, and the brandishing of his scourge, are seen in the lightnings and in tempests.

All the other sects of the Schiites think the Ghullats are

"damnable heretics." The Sonnites say the same of the Schiites in general, and the Ghullats in particular.

The differences between the true believers respecting the "Revealed Imaams," some closing the succession of them with the seventh, others with the twelfth Imaam, some holding that several *princely* qualities were essential to a legitimate Imaam, others that mere devotion and innocence were required, favoured the insidious views of the Ghullat which from the beginning of their career seems to have been to obtain power and influence, utterly regardless of the means by which this, their main object was attained.

The sacerdotal faction of the Imaamie believed in twelve Imaams, the last of whom, Mohammed Ben Hassen Askeri, disappeared in a grotto in Hella where he remains, but will re-appear at the end of the world, under the name of Mohdi. The other sacred faction of the same order called Sebün, only reckoned seven revealed Imaams namely—Ali (cousin of the prophet), his two sons Hassan and Hossein, Ali Seinolabidin, Mohammed Bekr, Jafer Sadik, Ismail, and seventh and last, the son of the preceding Ismail. Ismailites made their doctrine of seven Imaams, and succession from the seventh prevail, and their power originated with the first dynasty of the Fahmites in the interior of Africa, and on its coast, at Mahmadia and Cairo and one hundred and fifty years later, the mountainous regions of Irak in Persia, in Asia Minor, in and on the coasts of Syria.

The founder of the Asiatic Ismailites was Obeidallah, claiming to be fourth in descent from the seventh or last revealed Imaam. These rights of the family of Ismail were long and fiercely contested by the family and faction of the Abbassides, (friends and followers of Abbas) whose interest it was to dispute and disprove the validity of their rival genealogical claims and pretensions. A solemn but secret inquiry was instituted in the reign of the Caliph Kaderhilla into the claims of the Fahmite Ismailites to the throne of the Caliphate of Bagdad, and they were declared false and unfounded. Fifty

years later, for a year the two royal prerogatives of Islamism, namely—of coining money and of ordering public prayer were transferred from Egypt to Bagdad.

In fact, Islamism at this period was torn to pieces by the seventy-two sects that issued from its bosom in the very cradle of its infancy.

After the destruction of the Persian Empire by the Arabians, the disciples of Zoroaster looked on Islamism with contempt and disdain as well as hatred, and sought its ruin by corrupting its doctrine and sowing dissensions amongst its doctors and Imaams. While affecting to believe in the religion of their late conquerors and professing to receive the law of Islam, they managed to introduce secret doctrines and mysteries, polemical controversies, and principles of libertinism, which brought the religion of Mohammed into extreme jeopardy. Those whose opinions bore the stamp of libertinism and irreligion were called Sindik (Libertines). Their first appearance in Islamism was in the beginning of the Caliphate of the family of Abas, the first of whom endeavoured to exterminate them with the sword, especially in the eastern provinces of the Persian Empire. In the reign of the Caliph Mansur, A.D. 758, a sect of the Rawendi, holding the doctrine of the transmigration of souls revolted, and in A.D. 778, Abdul Kahir also revolted, and in the same year the disciples of the pseudo prophet of Mokanna, "the concealed," who shrouded from his followers the excessive glory of his human face divine with a golden mask, made a religious insurrection. Mokanna held the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, that God had assumed a human form, had commanded the angels to adore the first man, and since that period the divine nature had passed from prophet to prophet, to Abon Moslem the founder of the Abissides, and finally had descended to himself. Mokanna was the first to introduce into Islamism the doctrine of transmigration of souls. He afterwards added the Indian dogma of the incarnation of the human and divine nature as well as the metempsychosis adopted by the Ghullats.

The revolution which transferred the power of the Abbasides to the Fatimites, was a benefit rather than an injury to the Holy Land. "The third of these Fatimite Caliphs (we are told by Gibbon) was the famous Hakem, a frantic youth who was delivered by his impiety and despotism from the fear either of God or man, and whose reign was a wild mixture of vice and folly. Regardless of the ancient customs of Egypt, he imposed on the women an absolute confinement; the restraint excited the clamours of both sexes. Their clamours provoked his fury. A part of old Cairo was delivered to the flames, and the guards and citizens were engaged many days in a bloody conflict." At first the Caliph declared himself a zealous Mussulman, the founder or benefactor of moschs and colleges; twelve hundred and ninety copies of the Koran were transcribed at his expense in letters of gold, and his edict extirpated the vineyards of the Upper Egypt. But his vanity was soon flattered by the hope of introducing a new religion; he aspired above the fame of a prophet, and styled himself the visible image of the most high God, who after nine apparitions on earth, was at length manifest in his royal person. At the name of Hakem, the lord of the living and the dead, every knee was bent in religious adoration; his mysteries were performed on a mountain near Cairo; sixteen thousand converts signed his profession of faith; and at the present hour, a free and warlike people, the Druses of Mount Libanus, are persuaded of the life and divinity of a madman and a tyrant. In his divine character, Hakem hated the Jews and Christians, as the servants of his rivals; while some remains of prejudice or prudence still pleaded in favour of the law of Mahomet. Both in Egypt and Palestine his cruel and wanton persecution made some martyrs and many apostates; the common rights and special privileges of the sectaries were equally disregarded; and a general interdict was laid on the devotion of strangers and natives. The temple of the Christian world, the church of the resurrection, was demolished to its foundations; the luminous prodigy of Easter was interrupted, and much profane labour was exhausted to destroy the cave in

the rock which properly constitutes the holy sepulchre. At the report of this sacrilege, the nations of Europe were astonished and afflicted; but instead of arming in defence of the Holy Land, they contented themselves with burning or banishing the Jews as the secret advisers of the impious barbarians. *

The Arabic name of the Ishmaelian sectaries who were established in a mountainous district of Persia in 1090, A.D. was Haschisins, which in its Anglified form, assassins, is derived from the word Hascihsh, an intoxicating substance, used in a beverage, consisting chiefly of the pistils of the hemp plant. Their sacerdotal chiefs, it is said, used this beverage to procure trances, in which they pretended to receive divine communications. In Syria they established themselves in Anti-Lebanon, their principal stronghold was at Maysut or Maysiat, in the vicinity of Damascus. These fanatics formed a secret society, partly military, partly religious, and were particularly distinguished for their murderous atrocities in the 13th century. They were nearly exterminated in the following century.

In the year A.D. 1011, of the hegira, 411, of the innumerable Mahomedan sects that sprung up in Persia, Arabia, and Egypt, the predominant one was the Seveners or Ismailites.

In maintaining their sovereignty, the Seveners, or Ismailites, were more fortunate than the other sects. Their power first originated with the dynasty of the Fatamites, in Egypt on the coast and in the interior of Africa, and, one hundred and fifty years afterwards, in Asia, by the dominion of the Assassins, in the mountainous parts of Irak, and the coasts of Syria. By the oriental historians, the African Ismailites are termed the western, the Asiatic, the eastern Ismailites.

During the reign of the Khalif Kadirbillah, a secret assemblage of doctors of the laws was held, in which the most celebrated among them, declared the genuineness of the Fatimites' genealogy, and their claims to the throne, to be false and void. Out of the secret assemblages of the Seveners

* Gibbons Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Edition 12mo. p. 391.

or Ismailites in Cairo, and their grand lodge of renovators and reformers of the Mohammedan religion, forty five years later, about 1057, A.D. came the secret order of Assassins, first in Egypt and Persia, and in 1090 in Syria.

The fellows and the masters of the Cairo lodge, inundated the whole of Asia ; and one of the latter, Hassen-ben-Sabah Homairi, was the founder of a new branch of the sect, namely, the eastern Ismailites, or Assassins, before whose cradle we now stand.

Hassan Sabah, or Hassen-ben-Sabah, that is, one of the descendants of Sabah, was the son of Ali, a strict Shiite of Rei. He lived in obscurity, and unknown, during the ten years' reign of Alp-arslan. Immediately, however, after the accession of Melekshah, the son of Sabah also appeared at the court of the Sultan of the Seljukides, and with harsh words from the Koran, directed against promise breakers, reminded the vizier of the fulfilment of certain obligations of his youth. The vizier, Nisamolmulk received him with honour, procured him considerable titles and revenues, and introduced him to the sultan, of whom Hassan, by crafty hypocrisy, soon became master. The sultan consulted him on all important occasions, and acted according to his decision.

The lodge of Cairo, whose political aim was, to overthrow the khalifat of the family of Abbas, in favour of the Fatimites, spread its secret doctrine, by its Dais, (*i.e.* political and religious missionaries). To these were subordinate the ordinary partisans, Refik, or fellows, who, initiated into one or several grades of the mysteries, were, nevertheless, neither to teach them nor to collect the suffrages for any dynasty ; this being the peculiar privilege of the Dais, whose chief, the Dail-doat, or grand-master, resided at Cairo, in the House of Sciences. This institution remained unchanged, from its foundation by Hakem, in 1004 A.D., to the time of the Khalif, Emr-Biahkam-illah, when the Emir-oljuyush, or commander-in-chief of the army Efdhal, on the occasion of an insurrection fomented by the members of the lodge, caused it to be shut up, and, as it

appears, to be destroyed in 1312, A.D. When, after his death in the following year, the society strongly urged their re-opening, the vizier, Maimum, refused to open the academy on the same spot, but permitted them to erect, in a different situation, another building, dedicated to the same purpose, which was Darolilm-jedide (*i.e.* the New House of Sciences); where public courses of instruction and secret meetings, as before, continued, till the downfall of the Fatimite dynasty. The effects of their doctrine soon appeared in the increasing power of the Fatimites, and the feebleness into which the khalifat of the family of Abbas gradually sank. Hassan had been in Persia, already initiated into the Ismailite mysteries of Atheism and immorality, and had even been deemed worthy to become a teacher and promulgator of them. The fame of his great talents, and the authority which he had enjoyed at the court of Melekshah, preceded him; and the khalif Mostansur, delighted with the acquisition of such a partisan, received him with honour. The chief of the missionaries or grand-master of the lodge, Dail Doat, the Sherif Tahre Kaswimi, and some other persons of rank and influence, were despatched to the frontiers to meet him; Mostanssur assigned him a residence in the city, and welcomed him in the person of his ministers and court dignitaries, and loaded him with marks of honour and favour. According to some, Hassan remained eighteen months at Cairo, sufficiently long by meddling in affairs of state to excite a vast deal of envy, jealousy, and hatred. At length he found it necessary to take to flight, embarked for an African port on the northern coast, encountered a frightful tempest, and it is said while the storm was raging, manifested the utmost calmness and unconcern. It would appear, during that terrible storm, while the thunder was crashing over his head, and the lightning flashing in his eyes, that his thoughts were taken up with projects of revenge; amidst the fury of the tempest he was planning the foundation of that secret institution for the removal of his enemies,

taking off great personages, upsetting thrones, and wrecking dynasties.

A wind, contrary to the destination of the ship, but favourable to Hassan, drove them on the coasts of Syria instead of towards Africa; Hassan disembarked and proceeded to Aleppo, where he remained some time; thence he visited Bagdad, Khusistan, Ispahan, Yezd, and Kerman, everywhere publishing his doctrine: from Kerman he returned to Ispahan, where he resided four months, and then made a second excursion into Khusistan; after staying three months in this province, he fixed himself for as many years in Damaghan, and the surrounding country; he here made a great number of proselytes, and sent to Alamut as well as other fortresses of the place, agents of great powers of eloquence. After preparing everything here for the future maturity of his plans, he went to Jorjan, whence he directed his journey towards the castle of Alamut, which became the cradle of his power and greatness. He had already, some time before, sent to this stronghold one of his most zealous and skilful agents, Hoesein Kaini, to invite the inhabitants to swear fealty to the Khalif Mostansur. The greater number had already taken the accustomed oath to him. Ali Mehdi, the commandant, who held the fortress in the name of Melekshah, with a few others, remained faithful to his duty, acknowledging no other spiritual supremacy than that of the khalif of Bagdad, of the family of Abbas; and submitting to no other temporal prince than the sultan Melekshah, of the family of Seljuk.

Alamut (*i.e.* the vulture's nest) so called from its impregnability, is the largest and strongest of fifty castles scattered over the district of Rudbar, in the Province of Karwin in a mountainous district on the confines of Dilem and Irak.

Initiated into the highest grade of the lodge of Cairo, he clearly penetrated their plan of boundless ambition, whose object was nothing less than the destruction of the khalifat of the Abassides, and the raising new thrones on their ruins.

He, who had until now acted as Dai or religious nuncio and political envoy, in the name of the Fatimite khalif, Mostanssur, formed the resolution of founding an order of secret organization for his own objects; Hassan's experience taught him, by the slender results which the Ismailite mission had exhibited in Asia, how useless it was to attempt to propagate the secret doctrine of the lodge of Cairo, as long as its superiors had heads, but not hands at their disposal.

He set about gaining disciples, ostensibly for the promotion of religion, but in reality for the accomplishment of his ambitious and selfish projects, assuming an air of extraordinary sanctity and asceticism, and doing all things in the name of the caliph of Cairo.

He obtained possession of Alamut partly by stratagem, partly by force.

Hassan provided his new stronghold with ramparts and wells; he caused a canal to be dug, bringing the water from a considerable distance to the foot of the castle; he made plantations of fruit trees around the neighbourhood, and encouraged the inhabitants in the pursuit of agriculture. While he was thus employed in the fortification and defence of his castle, which commanded the whole district of Rudbar, promoting cultivation and raising supplies, his care and attention were still more deeply engaged with the establishment of his own religious and political system, namely, the peculiar policy of the Assassins.

The civil war between the brothers, Barkyarok and Mohammed, concerning the territories of Irak and Khorassan, facilitated the execution of Hassan's ambitious designs; and in the bloody hotbed of intestine discord, the poisonous plant of murder and sedition flourished. By degrees, his partisans made themselves masters of the strongest castles of Irak, and even of that of Ispahan, called Shah durye (the king's pearl), built by Melekshah.

Besides the king's pearl, they took also the castles of Derkul and Khalnenjan, near Ispahan, the castle of Wastamkuh, near

Abhar ; those of Tambur and Khalowkhan, between Fars and Kuhistan, those of Damaghan, Firuskuh, and Kirdkuh, in the province of Komis ; and lastly, Kuhistan, those of Tabas, Kain, Toon, and several others in the district of Muminabad.

Hitherto the Ismailites had only masters and fellows; namely, the Dais or emissaries, who being initiated into all the grades of the secret doctrine, enlisted proselytes; and the Refik, who, gradually intrusted with its principles, formed the great majority. It was manifest to the practical and enterprising spirit of Hassan, that in order to execute great undertakings with security and energy, a third class would also be requisite, who, never being admitted to the mystery of atheism and immorality, which snap the bonds of all subordination, were but blind and fanatical tools in the hands of their superiors ; that a well organised political body needs not merely heads but also arms, and that the master required not only intelligent and skilful associates, but also faithful and active agents: these agents were called Fedavie (*i.e.* the self-offering or devoted), the name itself declares their destination. How they afterwards, in Syria, obtained that of the Hashishin or Assassins, we shall explain hereafter when we speak of the means employed to animate them to blind obedience and fanatical self-devotion. Being clothed in white, like the followers of Mokanna, three hundred years before, in Transoxana, and, still earlier, the Christian Neophytes, and, in our own days, the pages of the sultan, they were termed Mobeyese, the white, or likewise, Mohammere the red, because they wore, with their white costume, red turbans, boots or girdles, as formerly did the warriors of the princes of Lebanon, and at Constantanople the Janissaries and Bostangis as a body guard of the seraglio. Habited in the hues of innocence and blood, and of pure devotion and murder, armed with daggers (cultelliferi) which were constantly snatched forth at the service of the grand-master, they formed his guard, the executioners of his deadly orders, the sanguinary tools of the ambition and revenge of this order of Assassins.

The grand master was called Sidna (Sidney) our lord, and commonly Sheikh al Jebal, the Sheikh, the old man or supreme master of the mountain; because the order always possessed themselves of the castles in the mountainous regions, both in Irak, Kuhistan, and Syria, and the ancient of the mountains, resided in the mountain fort of Alamut, robed in white, like the Ancient of days in Daniel. He was neither king nor prince in the usual sense of the word, and never assumed the title either of Sultan, Melek, or Emir, but merely that of Sheikh, which to this day the heads of the Arab tribes and the superiors of the religious order of the sofis and dervishes bear. His authority could be no kingdom or principality, but that of a brotherhood or order; the Dai, or religious nuncios, and political emissaries in ordinary, as initiated masters. The fellows (Refik) were those who were advancing to the mastership, through the several grades of initiation into the secret doctrine. The guards of the order, the warriors, were the devoted murderers (Fedavie), and the Lassik (aspirants) seem to have been the novices or lay brethren. Besides this seven-fold gradation from Sheikh (grand-master), Dailkebir (grand-prior), Dai (master), Refik (fellows), Fedavie (agents), Lassik (lay brothers), down to the profane or the people, there was also another seven-fold gradation of the spiritual hierarchy, who applied themselves exclusively to the before-mentioned doctrine of the Ismailis concerning the seven speaking and seven mute Imams, and belonged more properly to the theoretical frame-work of the schism, than to the destruction of political powers. According to this arrangement, there live, in every generation, seven persons distinguished from each other by their different grades of rank: 1st. The divinely appointed Imam; 2nd. "The witness" Hudshet, designated by him, whom the Ismailis called Esas, (the seat); 3rd. The Sumassa, who received instruction from the Hudshet, as they did from the Imam; 4th. The Missionaries (Dai); 5th. Mesuni, (the Freed) who were admitted to the solemn promise or oath (Ahd); 6th. Mukellebi, the dog-like, who sought out subjects fit for conversion for the missionaries,

as hounds run down the game for the huntsman; 7th. Mumini, the believers, the people. On comparing these two divisions, we perceive that, according to the first, the invisible Imam, in whose name the sheikh claimed the obedience of the people, and in the second, the guard, of which he made use against the foes of the order, are wanting; but that, in other respects, the different grades coincide. "The witness" was the grand-master; the Sumassa, the grand-prior; the fellows were the freed; and the dog-like the lay-brethren; the fourth and seventh, that is the preachers of the faith and the believers, the cheating missionaries, and the duped people are the same in both divisions.

The power of the order enlarged into three provinces, namely, Jebel, Kuhistan, and Syria.

The first founder of secret societies in the heart of Islamism, Abdollah Maimun, the son of Kaddah, established seven degrees of his doctrine, for which reason, as well as their opinions concerning the seven Imams, his disciples obtained the bye-name of Seveners. This appellation, which had been assigned, hitherto, to the western Ismailites, although they had increased the number of grades from seven to nine, was, with greater justice, transferred to their new branch, the eastern Ismailites or Assassins, whose founder, Hassan, the son of Sabah, not only restored the grades to their original number, seven, but also sketched out for the Dais, or missionaries, a particular rule of conduct, consisting of seven points, which had reference, not so much to the gradual enlightenment of those who were to be taught, as to the necessary qualifications of the teachers; and was the proper rubric of the order.

The first rule was called "The knowledge of the calling" or of initiation.

The second "The gaining of confidence."

The third "The trial by scrupulous examination and questions."

The fourth "Prescribes a form of oath called Ahd, enjoining in the most solemn manner secrecy and obedience to superiors."

The fifth "Teddlis" taught the concordance of their doctrines

and opinions with those of the Magnates of Church and State. This rule was framed with a view to excite Ambition and to fire youth with the example of the rich and powerful.

The sixth, Tessiss (i. e. *confirmation*), merely recapitulated all that had preceded, in order to confirm and strengthen the learner's faith. After this followed, in the seventh place, Teevil (i. e. *the allegorical instruction*), which was the conclusion of the course of atheistical instruction. In Teevil, the allegorical explanation, in opposition to Tensil, or the literal sense of the divine word, was the principal essence of the secret doctrine, from which they were named Bateni, the Esoterics, to distinguish them from the Jaheri, or followers of the outward worship. By means of this crafty system of exposition and interpretation, which, in our own days, has often been applied to the Bible, articles of faith and duties became mere allegories; the external form, merely contingent; the inner sense alone, essential; the observance, or non-observance of religious ordinances and moral laws, matters of indifference.

For a long period, the Assassins have only been known to Europe by the accounts of the Crusaders, and recent historians have dated their appearance in Syria later than it really took place. They, however, appeared in Palestine contemporaneously with the Crusaders; for, already, in the first year of the twelfth century of the Christian era, Jenaheddevlet, Prince of Emessa, fell beneath their daggers as he was hastening to the relief of the castle of the Kurds, Hossnal a-kurd, which was besieged by the Count St. Gilles. Four years before he had been attacked, by three Persian assassins, in his palace, as he was preparing for his devotions. Suspicion, as the author of this attempt, fell upon Riswan, Prince of Aleppo, the political opponent of Jenaheddevlet, and a great friend of the Assassins, who had gained him over by the agency of one of their emissaries, a physician, who was also an astrologer, and thus doubly qualified to deceive himself and others, without having recourse to the false doctrine of his order.

Sultan Sadjar had exhibited tokens of forbearance towards the Assassins; for on his journey from Khorassan to Irak, he visited at Damaghan the Reis Mosaffer, venerable both on account of his age and influence, who, as we have already seen, had declared himself an adherent of Hassan Sabah, and had obtained for him, by stratagem, the treasures of the Emir David Habeshi. Some officers proposed to demand them back, but on Mosaffer's representation, that he had always loaded the inhabitants of the place with favours, as the proper subjects of the sultan, Reis Mosaffer, respected and honoured as the patriarch of the new doctrine, at the age of one hundred and one, died at Damaghan in 1104 A.D.

Hassan Sabah survived the most faithful of his disciples, and his nearest relations, to whom the ties of attachment and consanguinity seemed to secure the highest rights to the succession to the sovereignty. His nephew and grand-prior in Syria, Abulfettah, had fallen by the sword of the enemy; Hossein Kaini grand-prior in Kuhistan, fell under the dagger of a murderer (probably Ostad), one of the two sons of Hassan: and Ostad and his brother fell under the hand of their own father, who seemed to revel even in spilling his own blood. Without proof or measure of guilt, he sacrificed them, not to offended justice, but apparently to mere love of murder, and that terrific policy, in virtue of which the order snapped, all ties of relationship or friendship, to bind the more closely, those of impiety and slaughter.

Ostad (i. e. *the master*), probably so called because the public voice had destined him as the successor of his father as grand-master, was put to death on the mere suspicion of being concerned in Hossein's murder; and his brother was slain, because he had drunk wine: the former, probably, because he had, by his crime, which was without orders, interfered with his father's prerogative; the latter, because he had infringed one of the least essential laws of Islamism, but whose strict observance was part of the system of the order. In the execution of his

two sons, the grand-master gave the profane and the initiated a sanguinary example of avenged disobedience to the ordinance of outward worship, and the rules of internal discipline.

Mewdud, the prince of Mossul, fell under the daggers of the Assassins at Damascus as he was walking with Togebrin, the Prince of that city on a feast day in the fore court of the great Mosque. An Assassin stabbed him, for which he lost his head on the spot.

The less the designs of the Ismailites prospered by the sword, the more successful and persevering were they with the dagger; and however dangerous to the order the times might be, they were not the less so to its most powerful adversaries. A long series of great and celebrated men, during the grand-mastership of Kiabusurgomid, fell by the poinards of his Fedavi, signalised the bloody annals of his reign; and, as formerly, according to the fashion of Oriental historians, there follows, at the end of each prince's reign, a catalogue of the great statesmen, generals, and literati, who have either adorned it by their lives, or troubled it with their death; so, in the annals of the Assassins, is found the chronological enumeration of celebrated men of all nations, who have fallen the victims of the Ismailites, to the joy of their murderers and the sorrow of the world.

Hitherto their attacks had been directed only against viziers and emirs, and subordinate instruments of the caliph's power; the throne itself, which they were undermining, had remained unstained by the blood of its possessors. The period, however, was now arrived, in which the order dared to seal their doctrine with the blood of those caliphs to whom it was so destructive, and to deprive the successors of the prophet, not merely of their temporal power, but likewise of their lives. The shadow of God on earth, as the caliphs called themselves, was, indeed, a mere shadow of earthly power; and was, when he would have asserted more, sent, by the dagger of the Assassin, to the shades below.

We have seen that the secret doctrine of the Ismailites de-

rived its origin from the lodge at Cairo, long before the foundation of the order of the Assassins; and flourished under the protection of the Fatimites, the rivals of the Assassins, and their competitors for the throne. By a just retribution, this protection of a doctrine of irreligion and immorality was avenged on the Fatimites themselves, by the murderous order which sprung from it. The Egyptian caliph, Abu Ali Manssur, tenth of the Fatimite dynasty (whose founder, Obeidollah, had made the lodge of the secret doctrine a part of his ministerial policy), fell, in the twenty-ninth year of his reign, under the dagger of the Assassin.

The doctrine of the Assassins was enveloped in a veil of the profoundest mystery, and ostensibly its maintainers appeared only as strict observers of the rites of Islamism. A proof of this is afforded by the answer given to the envoy of Sultan Sandjar, who had been sent from Rei to collect official information concerning the Ismailitic doctrines. He was told by the superiors, "Our doctrine is as follows:—We believe in the unity of God, and consider that, only as true wisdom, which accords with His word, and the commands of the prophet; we observe these, as they are given in the holy book of the Koran; we believe in all that the prophet has taught concerning the creation and the last day, rewards and punishments, the judgment and the resurrection. We believe that it is necessary so to do, and no one is permitted to pass his judgment on God's commands, or even to alter a letter of them. These are the fundamental rules of our sect; and if the Sultan approves them not, he may send one of his theologians to enter into polemical discussions on the subject."

What William, Bishop of Tyre, and James, Bishop of Acca, on the occasion of an embassy, despatched from the Old Man of the Mountain to the King of Jerusalem, in the year 1172, relate concerning the origin, system, and discipline of the Assassins, agrees very well with that we have derived from oriental sources. "The Assassins," say they, "were formerly the strictest observers of the laws of Mohammedanism, till the

epoch when a grand master of genius and erudition, and intimately acquainted with the Christian tenets, and the doctrine of the Gospel, abolished the prayers of Mohammed, annulled the fasts, and allowed all, without distinction, to drink wine and eat pork. The fundamental rule of their religion, consists in blind submission to their abbot, by which alone they could attain eternal life. This lord and master, who is generally called the Old Man, resides in the Persian province, lying beyond Bagdad (Jebal or Irak-Ajemi). There (at Alamut) young men are educated in the secret tenets and pleasures, instructed in various languages, and then sent, armed with their daggers, throughout the world, to murder Christians and Saracens without distinction; either from hatred, as being enemies of their order, or to please its friends, or for the sake of a rich reward. Those who had sacrificed their lives in the fulfilment of this duty, were adjudged to greater happiness in Paradise, as being martyrs; their surviving relations were loaded with gifts, or, if slaves, set at liberty. Thus was the world overrun by these miserably misled youths, who devoted to murder, issued joyfully from their brethren's convent, to execute the sanguinary commands they had received; appearing in different forms and disguises, sometimes as monks, sometimes as merchants; in fact, in such a variety of shapes, and with so much prudence and caution, that it was impossible for the destined victims to escape their daggers." . . .

Rashideddin Abulhasher Sinan, son of Suleiman, of Basra, pretended that he was himself an incarnation of the Deity. He never showed himself but in coarse dresses of hair; he was never seen to eat, or drink, or sleep, or spit. From the top of a rock he preached to the people from sunrise to sunset, and was long considered by his audience as a superior being. When, however, they discovered that he limped, from having been wounded by a stone in a great earthquake, A.D. 1157, he was near losing both the sanctity of his character, and his life, the people wishing to murder him as an impostor. He exhorted them to patience, descended from the rock, where he had

preached so long as a Stylite, invited his hearers to a banquet, and succeeded, by the power of his eloquence, in inducing them unanimously to swear obedience and fealty to him as their superior. He seized the moment when the grand master of the Ismailites in Persia had exposed all the mysteries, and by that means sapped the foundations of the order, to envelope himself in the halo of an apostle, and confirm his dominion in Syria.

For this reason he is unanimously considered by oriental historians as the chief of the Ismailitic doctrine in Syria; and even to this day his writings are esteemed canonical by the Ismailites still remaining in that country. They consist of a shapeless chaos of contradictory articles of faith, which probably are all to be understood only allegorically; a host of mutilated passages from the Koran and the Gospels, hymns, litanies, sermons, prayers, and ritual ordinances. These can hardly have been preserved in their original purity, but must have descended to us intermixed with the superstition and ignorance of later centuries, like the books of the Druses, who, now as little acquainted as the Ismailites with the spirit of their founder, possess but a very imperfect knowledge of their original dogmas, and have lost the tradition of the allegorical doctrine.

The secret offer made by the grand prior of the Assassins that he and his followers would undergo baptism, providing the Templars, their nearest neighbours on the mountains, would release them from the annual impost of two thousand ducats, and live in brotherly love and peace with them was frustrated by an untoward event.

In the centre of the Persian, as well as of the Assyrian territory of the Assassins, that is to say, both at Alamut and Massiat, were situated, in a space surrounded by walls, splendid gardens—true eastern paradises.

The music of the harp was mingled with the songs of birds, and the melodious tones of the female singers harmonised with the murmur of the brooks. Everything breathed pleasure, rapture, and sensuality.

A youth, who was deemed worthy, by his strength and resolution, to be initiated into the Assassin service, was invited to the table and conversation of the grand master, or grand prior; he was then intoxicated with *hashishe*, and carried into the garden, which, on awakening he believed to be paradise; every thing around him, the houris in particular, contributed to confirm his delusion. After he had experienced as much of the pleasures of paradise which the prophet has promised to the blessed, as his strength would admit, after quaffing enervating delight from the eyes of the houris, and intoxicating wine from the glittering goblets, he sunk into the lethargy produced by narcotic draughts, on awakening from which, after a few hours, he again found himself by the side of his superior. The latter endeavoured to convince him that corporeally he had not left his side, but that spiritually he had been wrapped into paradise, and had then enjoyed a foretaste of the bliss which awaits the faithful, who devote their lives to the service of the faith, and the obedience of their chiefs. Thus did these infatuated youths blindly dedicate themselves as the tools of murder, and eagerly sought an opportunity to sacrifice their lives, in order to become partakers of a paradise of sensual pleasure. What Mohammed had promised in the Koran to the Moslimin, but which to many might appear a dream and mere empty promises, they had enjoyed in reality; and the joys of heaven animated them to deeds worthy of hell. This imposture could not remain undiscovered; and the fourth grand master, after unveiling all the mysteries of impiety to the people, probably revealed also to them the joys of paradise, which could besides, have but little charms for them, to whom already everything was permitted on earth. That which hitherto had served as a means to produce pleasure, became now itself an object; and the effects of the intoxication of opium, were the earnest of celestial delights which they wanted strength to enjoy.

To this day Constantinople and Cairo show what an incredible charm opium with henbane exerts on the drowsy indolence of the Turk, and the fiery imagination of the Arab; and explains

the fury with which these youths sought the enjoyment of these rich pastiles *(hashishe)*, and the confidence produced in them, so that they are able to undertake anything or everything. From the use of these pastiles, they were called *Hashishin* (herb-eaters),* which, in the mouths of the Greeks and Crusaders, has been transformed into the word Assassin ; and, as synonymous with murder, has immortalised the history of the order in all the languages of Europe.

In A.D. 1253, and the year of the Hegira 651, Tandju Newian, the general of Mangu Khan, who covered the frontiers of Iran, sent to his master the ambassadors of the caliph of Bagdad, who complained of the atrocities of the Assassins, and besought him to extirpate the vile race. Their complaints were seconded by those of the judge of Kaswin, who was at the Khan's court, and went in armour to the audience, fearing the daggers of the Assassins, against whose crimes he raised the voice of humanity. Mangu immediately collected an army, which he placed under the command of his brother, Hulaku.

The last grand master of the order of Assassins was Rockneddin. After an existence of nearly two centuries, the crimes of this organised association of murderers, which had long been filling to overflowing the cup of retributive vengeance, drew down on them the wrath of heaven.

The tempest of destruction came suddenly and unexpectedly on the Assassins in all their strongholds. The Mogul power of Zinghis Khan, thundering in the distance, had passed inocuously over their heads, but under the third of his successors, Mangu Khan, the whirlwind of Mogul conquest swept over the eastern world, and in its progress, carried away, along with the Caliphate of Bagdad, other thrones and dynasties, and the power of the Assassins.

At the end of the fifth century of the Hegira, about 1078 A.D.,

* See the circumstantial proof of this indubitable genealogy, in the Memoire sur la Dynastie des Assassins, et sur l'Origine de leur Nom ; by M. Silvestre de Sacy : read at the Institute, 7th July, 1809. And a letter of M. Silvestre de Sacy to the Editor of the Moniteur, on the Etymology of the name of the Assassins.—Moniteur, No. 359, year 1809.

the deluge of the Assassins inundated the whole of Asia; and at the end of the sixth, Zinghis Khan rushed on like a hurricane, and the earth quaked under the hoofs of the Moguls. The rage of the tempest afterwards spread through all Asia, and the shocks of the earthquake carried their ruin as far as Europe.

Mangu had issued the command to Hulaku, to exterminate all the Ismailites, and not to spare even the infant at its mother's breast; and immediately on Rokneddin's departure, the sanguinary task was commenced, which had only been delayed till Kirdkuh, and the remainder of the castles of the Assassins in Kuhistan and Syria should have fallen. He sent one of his viziers to Kaswin, to put to death indiscriminately, Rokneddin's wives, children, brothers, sisters and slaves; only two relations (females apparently) of Rokneddin, were selected from this devoted band, not for mercy, but to be the victims of the princess, Bulghan Khatun's private revenge, her father, Jagatai, having bled by the Assassin's daggers. A command, similar to that given to the governor of Kaswin, was issued to the viceroy of Khorassan. He assembled the captive Ismailites, and twelve thousand of those wretched creatures were slaughtered without distinction of age. Warriors went through the provinces, and executed the fatal sentence without mercy or appeal. Wherever they found a disciple of the doctrine of the Ismailites, they compelled him to kneel down, and then cut off his head. The whole race of Kia Busurgomid, in whose descendants the grand mastership had been hereditary, were exterminated. The "devoted to murder," were not now the victims of the order's vengeance, but that of outraged humanity. The sword was against the dagger, the executioner destroyed the murderer. The seed, sowed for two centuries, was now ripe for the harvest, and the field ploughed by the Assassin's dagger was repeated by the sword of the Mogul. The crime had been terrible, but no less terrible was the punishment.

The castles of the Assassins in Rudbar and Kuhistan, Kain Tun, Lamsir, and even Alamut, the capital, were now in the

hands of the victor. Kirdkuh alone, in the district of Damaghan, whose garrison had been encouraged not to yield, by Rokneddin, when on his way to Mangu, resisted the besieging forces of the Moguls for three years.

The princes of Ruyan and Masenderam having done homage to the overwhelming power of Hulaku Khan, received his commands to besiege Kirdkuh, while he was engaged in his expedition against Bagdad. Hulaku Khan promised himself a large result from the wisdom of his measures, in imposing upon them both the conduct of the siege of Kirdkuh.

The two Princes, without waiting for the Khan's permission, raised the siege and marched home, unmindful of the wrath of Hulaku Khan, of which they soon felt the weight.

After the fall of Alamut, the residence of the grand-master of the assassins, and the centre of the order, Atamelik Jowaini, the learned vizier and historian, asked and obtained from Hulaku, permission to search the celebrated library and archives of the order, for the purpose of saving the works which might be worthy of the khan's preserving. He laid aside the Koran and some other precious books, and committed to the flames, not only all the philosophical and sceptical works, containing the Ismailite doctrine, and written in harmony with it, but also all the mathematical and astronomical instruments, and thus at once destroyed every source from which history might have derived a more circumstantial account of the dogmas of the Ismailites, and the statutes of the order. Fortunately, in his own history, he preserved the results of the information which he derived from the library and archives of the order, together with a biographical sketch of Hassan Sabah, from which all the more modern Persian historians, as Mirkhond, have collected their stories, and which we have followed.

After the castles of the assassins in Kudbar and Kuhistan had been razed to the ground, numbers of the order massacred, and a still greater number scattered, they still maintained their stand for fourteen years in the mountains of Syria against the armies of the Monguls, the Franks, and the Egyptian Sultan

Bibars. In the year 1269 A. D. when Sultan Bibars was marching against the Franks, in Syria, the commanders of the different towns appeared to do him homage. Nejmeddin, the grand-master of the Assassins, however, instead of following this example, requested a diminution of the tribute, which the order now paid to the Sultan instead of the Franks. Saremeddin Mobarek, the commandant of the Ismailite fortress, Alika, had formerly drawn upon himself the anger of the sultan; but having received pardon on the intercession of the governor of Sihinn, or, according to others, of Hama, he appeared with a numerous suite, in Bibar's presence, who received him into favour and loaded him with honours. He granted him the supreme command of all the castles of the Ismailites in Syria, which were no longer to be governed by Nejm eddin, but by Saremeddin, in the name of the Sultan of Egypt.

In the meanwhile, in 1270 A.D. Saremeddin having taken possession of Massiat, drove out Aseddin, the governor named by the Sultan; but not being able to maintain the place against the approaching forces of the Sultan, he threw himself into the castle of Alika.

Nejmeddin, the former grand-prior, again held the command of the Ismailite castles in Syria, in the name of the Sultan, by whom Shemseddin was retained at court, as the pledge of his father's fidelity. Bibars eventually caused Shemseddin and all his suite to be arrested, and carried into Egypt. At the same time, two officers of the order, who had persuaded their friends in the castle of Khawabi, to surrender to the Sultan, were seized at Sarmin. This castle surrendered to negotiation, that of Kolaia to force; and, in the following year, those of Menifa and Kadmus fell into the sultan's hands.

From this moment, Bibars was master of all the forts and castles which had been in the possession of the Ismailites; and he ruined their power in Syria, as Hulaku had done in Persia. Next to Massiat, the residence of the grand-master, Shiun, a strong place on a rock, abundantly supplied with water, and at a short day's journey from Latakia, had been

lately particularly distinguished, by the valiant exploits of its commandant, Hamsa, one of the greatest heroes among the Syrian Ismailites. This Hamsa must not be confounded with Hamsa, the companion of the prophet, and one of the bravest heroes of Mohammedanism; nor with Hamsa, the founder of the religion of the Druses. The numerous battles and enterprises of the Assassins, their valorous defence against the armies of the Crusaders, and the Egyptian sultan, Bibars, and the adventurous character of their whole history, offered a fertile source to the Syrian romance writers and story-tellers; a source of which they did not fail to avail themselves.

The conquest of Massiat was succeeded by that of Alika, and, at length, two years after, by that of Kahaf, Mainoka Kadmus, and of the other castles on the Antilebanon; and thus the power of the Ismailites was overthrown, both in Syria and Persia. One of their last attempts at assassination is said to have been directed against the person of St. Louis, King of France, but the falsity of this supposition has already been demonstrated, by French writers.

The power of the Ismailites had now terminated, both in Persia and Syria; the citadels of the grand-master, in Rudbar, and of the grand-priors, in Kuhistan and Syria, had fallen; the bands of the Assassins were massacred and scattered: their doctrine was publicly condemned, yet, nevertheless, continued to be secretly taught, and the order of the Assassins, endured long after its suppression. In Kuhistan, in particular, remains of them still existed.

Remains of the Ismailites still exist both in Persia and Syria, but merely as one of the many sects and heresies of Islamism, without any claims to power, without the means of obtaining their former importance, of which they seem, in fact, to have lost all remembrance. The policy of the secret state-subverting doctrine of the first lodge of the Ismailites, and the murderous tactics of the Assassins, are equally foreign to them. Their writings are a shapeless mixture of Ismailite and Christian traditions, glossed over with the ravings of the mystic theology.

Their places of abode are, both in Persia and Syria, those of their forefathers, in the mountains of Irak, and at the foot of Antilebanon.

The Persian Ismailites recognise, as their chief, an imam, whose descent they deduce from Ismael the son of Jafer-Essadik, and who resides at Khekh, a village in the district of Kum, under the protection of the shah. As, according to their doctrine, the Imam is an incarnate emanation of the Deity, the Imam of Khekh enjoys, to this day, the reputation of miraculous powers; and the Ismailites, some of whom are dispersed as far as Innia, go in pilgrimage, from the banks of the Ganges and the Indus, in order to share his benediction. The castles in the district of Rudbar, in the mountains of Kuhistan, particularly in the vicinity of Alamut, at the end of the last century, were still inhabited, to this day, by Ismailites, who, according to a late traveller, go by the general name of Hosseinis.

The Syrian Ismailites live in eighteen villages, dispersed round their ancient chief place, Massiat, and are under the rule of a sheikh or emir, who is the nominee of the governor of Hamah. Being clothed in a pelisse of honour, he engages to pay to Hamah an annual sum of sixteen thousand five hundred piastres: his vassals are divided into two parties, the Suweidani and Khisrewi: the former so named after one of their former sheikhs; the latter, for their extraordinary veneration of the prophet Khiser (Elias), the guardian of the spring of life: the former, who are by far the smaller number, live principally at Feudara, one of the eighteen places under the jurisdiction of Massiat.

The Nossairis, or Nasarieyhs, the neighbours and enemies of the Ismailites, possessed themselves, by treachery, of their chief fortress, Massiat; the inhabitants were pillaged and murdered; the booty amounted to more than a million piastres, in value. The governor of Hamah did not suffer this rash enterprise of the Nossairis to go unpunished; he besieged Massiat, and compelled them to resign the fortress to its ancient possessors; the latter, however, sunk into complete political insignificance.

Externally they practice the duties of Islamism with austerity, although they internally renounce, them: they believe in the divinity of Ali; in uncreated light as the principle of all created things; and in the Sheikh Rashideddin, the grand-prior of the order in Syria, contemporary with the grand-master, Hassan II., as the last representative of the Deity on earth.

We shall mention here, in passing, as they are neighbours of the Ismailites, that the Nossairis, the Metewellis, and the Druses, three sects anathematized by the Moslems, on account of their infidelity and impiety have some secret affinities. Their doctrine agrees, in many points, with that of the Ismailites; their founders having been animated with the same spirit of extravagant fanaticism,—of unprincipled licentiousness. The Nossairis and Druses are both older in their origin than the eastern Ismailites; the former having appeared in Syria, as a branch of the Karmathites, as early as the fifth century of the Hegira; the latter received their laws from Hamsa, a missionary of Hakembiemillah's from the lodge of Cairo. The former believe, like the Ismailites, in the incarnation of the divinity in Ali; the latter consider that maddest of tyrants, Hakembiemillah, as a god in the flesh. Both abjure all the rules of Islamism, or only observe them in appearance; both hold secret and nocturnal assemblies stigmatized by the Moslimin, where they give themselves up to the enjoyment of wine and promiscuous intercourse.

The origin and doctrine of the Metewelli is less known than that of the Nossairis and Druses. Their name is corrupted from Metewilin, the *interpreters*; and therefore, probably, indicates a sect of the Ismailites, who taught the *Tenvil*, or allegorical interpretation of the commands of Islamism, in opposition to the *Tensil*, or positive letter of the word, not from God, the sense of which is a command to the true believer.

The reproach of immorality, which these sects share in common, is certainly much more applicable to the Metewellis than to their neighbours. For the inhabitants of the village of Martaban, on the road from Latakia to Aleppo, who are sin-

gularly vitiated and depraved, are Metewellis. In still worse report than the Ismailites, Metewellis, Nassairis and Druses, are some tribes of Syrian and Assyrian kurds, who are called Yezidis, because they hold in peculiar veneration Yezid, the khalif of the Ommia family, who persecuted, sanguinarily, the family of the prophet, and likewise propitiated the devil, and never cursed him like other Moslimin. Their sheikh is called Karàbash, that is, Blackhead, because he covers his head with a black scarf. The name of their founder is Sheikh Hadi, who, according to opinion, prayed, fasted, and gave alms for all his future disciples; so that they believed themselves exempted from these duties of Mohammedanism, and that, in consideration of his merits, they will go to heaven without appearing before the tribunal of God.

All these still existing sects are designated by the Moslimin, generally, Sindike (*freethinkers*), Mulhad (*impious*), and Batheni (*esoterics*), and, on account of their nocturnal assemblies, sometimes the one, sometimes the other, receive from the Turks the name of *Mumsoindiren*, or the *extinguishers*; because, according to the accusations of their religious adversaries, they extinguish the lights, for purposes of debauchery.

The ostensible object of the institution of the lodge of Ismailite Illuminati at Cairo, was in itself sufficiently laudable, and the exoteric doctrine had merely for its avowed object the extension of knowledge, and the mutual support of the members. The house of science, at Cairo, or the public school of the lodge, was the temple of the sciences, and the model of all acadamies; the greater number of the members were certainly deceived into good faith by the fair exterior of a beneficent, philanthropical, knowledge-spreading form; they were a kind of Freemasons, whose native country, as we have seen, may really be sought and found in Egypt, if not in the most ancient times, at least in the history of the middle ages. As in the west, revolutionary societies arose from the bosom of the Freemasons, so in the east, did the Assassins spring from the Ismailites.

The dominion of the Assassins sunk under the iron tramp of

the Mogul General, Kulaku. Their fall drew after it that of the ancient throne of the Caliph of Bagdad and of other dynasties.

In writing the history of the Assassins, the object of the author was to present a lively picture of the pernicious influence of secret societies in countries whose governments are weak or wicked, and of the dreadful prostitution of religion to the vile interests of unprincipled ambition.*

"The extermination of the Assassins or Ishmaelians of Persia (says Gibbon), by Holagan Khan, the grand-son of Zinghis Khan, may be considered as a service to mankind. Among the hills to the south of the Caspian, these odious sectaries had reigned with impunity above a hundred and sixty years; and their prince, or Imam, established his lieutenant to lead and govern the colony of Mount Lebanon, so famous and formidable in the history of the Crusades. With the fanaticism of the Koran, the Ismaelians had blended the Indian transmigration, and the visions of their own prophets; and it was their first duty to devote their souls and bodies in blind obedience to the vicar of God. The daggers of his missionaries were felt both in the East and West; the Christians and the Moslems enumerate, and perhaps multiply, the illustrious victims that were sacrificed to the zeal, avarice or resentment, of "the old man," as he was corruptly styled "of the mountain." But these daggers, his only arms, were broken by the sword of Holagan, and not a vestige left of the enemies of mankind, except the word *assassin*, which in the most odious sense has been adopted in the languages of Europe."

* The preceding details of the origin, practices, career, and fall of the Order Assassins, are taken mainly from the "History of the Assassins," by Von Hammer.

CHAPTER VIII.

The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Ansayrii.

Maundrell, in " His journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem," in 1797, 5th Ed. Ox. p. 12, 8vo. makes mention of a remarkable tribe he met with near Jebilee, a town in a mountainous district that runs along the coast, not far from Latakia :—" Above Jebilee (says Maundrell) there dwell a people called by the Turks " Neceres " of a very strange and singular character. It is their principle to adhere to no certain religion, but chameleon like, they put on the color of religion whatever it is, which is reflected on them from the persons with whom they happen to converse. With Christians they profess themselves Christians : with Turks they are good Mussulmans ; with Jews they pass for Jews ; being such Proteuses in religion, that nobody was ever able to discover of what shape or standard their consciences are ; all that is certain concerning them is, they make good wine, and are great drinkers."

Several travellers ascribe the same obscene rites and idolatrous practices to the Druses, in general which Warbuton ascribes to the Nasairi and Quadri-Mousi: "The Nasairi (says Warburton) performed daily the most obscene worship, the latter are supposed to adore a golden Calf, as the Persians do Ahriman, the origin of evil ; this calf symbolizing Eblis, the spirit at issue, with that of the Hakim."

The Druses are divided into two ranks—the initiated, who are made acquainted with the mysteries of their religion, admitted into the sacred assemblies, are supposed to be "spiritual" and self-concentrated, of an interior life, are called Fawil; the vulgar, or people at large, uninitiated, those whose minds are occupied with external things and objects of sense are called Teizel.

Between the two, novices hold a sort of middle rank, they were named "Nasairi" and also "Quadri-Mousi."

The former I suppose are the people of whom Maundrell makes mention under the name of Neseres.

"Volney mentions that the Ansayrii are divided into several classes, among which we may distinguish the Shemsia, or adorers of the Sun; the Kelbia, or worshippers of the Moon; the Kadmousee, who, as I am assured, worship woman.

"On Ansayrii and the Assassins—Travels in the Further East in 1850-51," (published in two vols. 8vo) is the title of a remarkable work written by the Hon. F. Walpole, R. N., the production of a gentleman, a tolerant Christian, an enlightened English traveller, with a rare talent for conciliating the people amongst whom he travelled, and obtaining from them information which foreigners, especially Englishmen, find it exceedingly difficult to procure in Syria.

In this work we have most valuable information respecting a people of whom previously we knew very little, of their religion nothing at all. I do not concur in the views of Mr. Walpole as to the connection of the Ansayrii with the Assassins of Syria. but I am sensible of the value of the information he has collected respecting them, and I beg to call particular attention to it as affording strong testimony in favour of the opinion I entertain that their religious tenets and superstitions are derived from the Druses, who must be looked upon as the only true representatives in Syria of the Ishmailian sect of the followers of Ali from whom the Assassins are derived.

"Avoiding the crowded and slippery streets I skirted the town, passed the mosque of St. George, formerly the church of

the same name, and crossing the Nahr el Beyrout, descended to the beach which stretches six or seven miles away in a bold sweep, until it runs to the point forming the south side of the Nahr el Kelb. The mountains above rise in graceful beauty, thickly sprinkled with Druse and Maronite villages, while here and there a convent rises like a pinnacle, in strong position; this is the mountain district of the south, which is bounded by the Nahr El Kelb on the north, and inhabited by a mixed population of Druses and Christians."*

The province of Kesrowan is the principal stronghold of the Maronites. Except a few christians of other sects, there are no other inhabitants."

"There is a constant feud between the Arabs and the Ansayrii; I mean these Fellah Arabs of the sea coast, for they tell me they never crossed the mountains, but winter and summer abode in that plain."

"The Ansayrii assured me to-day they never taught their religion to their women. 'Would you have us teach them,' he said, 'whom we use, our holy faith?' The Ansayrii are now, also, from all I could gather, divided into several sects; for interpreting to him several tenets of Zoroaster, he appeared to be struck with my knowledge, they always parry me by 'Your faith, my Lord Frankmason?' (Freemason).

At the Kalaat of Kadmous, Walpole gives an insight into the manners of the interior life of the Kadmousee. "At the door was an old man with a loaded pistol; he watched there day by day ready to fire the alarm on the smallest trace of danger, for the Ismaylee, though nominally at peace, are in perpetual dread of an attack from the Ansayrii . . .

"They all maintained they were strict and conscientious followers of the Prophet, though, as we shall see, I got one of them afterwards to contradict himself in this. Their Mosque had no domes, the roof was flat, but the door seemed closed, and the whole had an air as if little frequented.

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii, p. 3.—10.

"The Ameer of the Kadmousee told us that their people, numbering 20,000 fighting men, came—I think he said 27,000 people in all—from Damascus 846 years ago; say 1010 A.D.: that they fought with and drove out the Ansayrii from the castles of the mountains, from Kalaat el Kadmous, Kalaat el Kohf, el Aleyka, el Mazzyad, el Hosen, el Merkab, el Mehalbee, el Sion, el Ailaka, and numerous others he mentioned, whose names I forgot; that several of these, such as Merkab, Sion, Mehalbee, and Hosen, had been again retaken by Melek el Daher. If this was the son of Saladin, 1193 A.D., they did not enjoy many of their conquests long.

"Volney ascribes the Ansayrii religion to the year 891 A.D., and the chronology may be correct. They now possess Kalaat el Mazzyad, el Kadmous, el Kohf, el Aleyka, and el Merkab, and according to their own account, number 4,000 fighting men. They have villages also in the district of Mazzyard, of Kadmous, of Mawary, and I heard of a few also in Djebel Acra, north of Tripoli.

"At Kadmous there are two Montselims, the Ameer Assad Heisin Kabeel, and the Montselim of the castle, and the Ameer Selin Assed; these are cousins; they were our kind hosts. Their cousin the Ameer Melkein commands at Mazzyad." . . .

"At this period they were called Salleha Hireb, or "The Righteousness of Job." Asserting they are descendants of Ismael, son of Abraham, the beloved, they style themselves Beni Ismaeli: hence Ismaylee. Their other appellations, Kadmousie, or Khodansee are given them from Kadmous. The name Mokledjye means robber: hence a family village, or set, who are noted robbers, receive the name; but it is given to no sect: the Turks would use the term probably for all the mountaineers who resist their exactions.

"Volney mentions the Kadmousie as a sect of the Ansayrii, but the two people have no personal resemblance, and hold each other in abhorrence. In fact either sect have told me the other was their natural enemy, and that it was right and their duty to slay them.

"At Kadmous, the Ansayrii, who have some villages in the district, whenever they visit the Ameer, are disarmed at the outer gate. The Ansayrii have told me, that, in former times, the Kadmousie slew a great religious chief of theirs, and this made a feud which no blood, no money can efface.

"The Ameer told me on a visit he paid me afterwards at Latakia, that they had persons of their sect not only at Killis, but in the country around Mosul; that they were known as Koords and Turcoman people; that like themselves, here fearing the persecution of the Turks, they nominally are Mussulmans, and when in town conform to the outward forms of their sect. His remarks on their faith shewed, that if a Mussulman, he at least did not fear to curse the Prophet." . . .

"They say they are descended from Ishmael, the son of Abraham the beloved; that they left Damascus A.D. 1010: the case was, that they were persecuted; this they own now." . . .

"In the year A.D. 999, the Hakem reigned in Egypt, the Hakem-b-amr-illah governing by the order of God, as he styled himself; soon came from Persia, Mohammed-ben-Ismael, (Mohammed son of Ishmael), who was styled the Hakem-Hakem-b-amr-eh, governing by his own order. This the Druses say, was the second meeting of Ormuzd and Ahriman, the two principles of good and evil, or darkness."

The Ansayrii are divided into two parties, the Shemsin and the Clausee. The one have Sheik Habeel, Sheik Abbas, and Sheik Ibrahim Saide for their spiritual heads; with them the priesthood is hereditary, and has been so for generations. The Shemsia have Sheik Abdullah, of Demsuko, Sheik Sulieman, and another, I believe, north, by Antioch, as their heads. Their feuds are of perhaps two hundred years' standing, and as the doctrines maintained on either side are not demonstrable, by direct proof or acknowledged writ, they can never be arranged. These two parties hold no communication, and are often at war.

"The present feud was actively inflamed by a man of the Drousee carrying off a ploughing ox from the other party; this

produced a reprisal; this a fight, and so on. Both sides see the great folly of the war, yet both refuse to come to any terms. Things were at this juncture when Sheik Abdallah, of Kerneen, came and entreated my interference. I went with him alone, thinking it best not to have servants, and we reached the house of Shemseen Sultan, at a little before daylight. Here we heard that on the previous evening, Shemseen had been sent for, and was now on the field of battle, some five hours further in the mountains.

"In about four hours we heard firing, and turned to the house whence it came. A noble valley lay before us, and up this we rode along the bed of a mountain stream, the scenery the wildest imaginable. The firing was now close to us, but we saw nobody; proceeding further we came upon a poor woman; she had fallen down between two rocks, and there lay moaning,—painfully with each moan her heart's blood welled out from a dreadful wound, just below the right breast. With the cloth from my loins I bound it up, pressing a pad of stone tight over the wound, and placing her in the shade, within reach of water, in as comfortable a position as the time would allow. By this time the firing was pretty close; luckily the gully was deep, so we were completely protected. The Sheik rather reproved me for taking so much care of a woman.

"Suddenly about a hundred men made their appearance from the covert where before they had been concealed. These, we found were a party of Drousee, who had been despatched from the main force to burn a village just before us; that by some means their march had been discovered, and they had lost four men and the poor woman, who had come with her husband to carry bread to Leban. Finding they were worsted, they had fled across the valley up which we had ridden, and there had made a stand under cover of the bushes. They had left all their dead and wounded but one, and this was a noble-looking young fellow, to whom they led me.

"Sheik Abdallah and myself again descended the valley, and mounted the opposite side, where we found full three hundred

men. It had been no difficult matter to persuade the beaten party to retire from a fight they were anxious to quit; but with the victors it was different.

"In the evening I reached the head quarters, and found about nine hundred men on a ridge, in face, as they said, of about five thousand, though probably of about the same number, Sheik Shemseen was there; his jolly, social, easy nature quite put out by his difficulties; and as he told me, fighting one's self was much easier than preventing others from fighting. The sheiks of the Drousee were invited to meet and make a conference, but they refused. At last, however, they agreed, if hostages were given, and I went over and remained with them. They treated me most hospitably, and put no restraint whatever upon me, even accompanying me over to the other party. On the following day the sheiks returned, but no terms would they agree to.

"In my interview with the sheiks of the Drousee, the women were the most violent advocates for war; many were perfectly furious. 'Are our breasts without milk? Can we have no more children? Are we sheep that we are to be driven without biting? Your beard is white, you, sheik keep at home; the youths and the men will go to the fight. And you—you, Bey, —your hand was made for the sword, your body for the war,— not to talk, like a greybeard.' Even the children yelled at me. 'You wish us to be eaten with your peace; if you love us, lead us to the fray.' Girls said, 'Do you love the young girl? Go and fight bravely, and deserve her; she will not come to the coward. The faint hearted is a poor lover.' The young men seemed less wild than these Amazons. . . .

"The term Ansayrii seems at least as ancient as Pliny, who says (Hist. Plin. v. 23), 'Cæle habet Assamiam Marsya amne divisam à naycrinorum tetrarchia.' This would give them an antiquity far beyond any that can be claimed for them; but Pliny was probably correct; so we may suppose the country, or rather mountains, were named as now, then the Ansayrii, and inhabited by another race.

"William of Tyre, mentions a race as met by the Crusaders on their march from Antioch, whom he calls Assassins; they were under a chief, Sheik el Djebel—literally, the old man of the mountain—nor does the devotion they showed at all differ from what they would as readily show to-day.

"Gibbon says:—'But the extirpation of the Assassins, or Ishmalians of Persia, may be considered as a service to mankind. Among the hills to the south of the Caspian, these odious sectarians had reigned with impunity, for above one hundred and sixty years, and their Prince, or Imam established his lieutenant to lead or govern the colony of Mount Libanus, so famous and formidable in the history of the Crusades. With the fanaticism of the Koran these people had blended the Indian's transmigration, and the visions of their own prophet, and it was their first duty to devote their souls and bodies in blind obedience to God.'

"Now these so nearly resemble the doctrines of the Ansayrii, their religion is such a mixture of the Magian and the Mussulman; the names, also, so nearly resemble each other, that perhaps, as yet I only venture to say perhaps, they may claim their right, their name—a byword and reproach among us all.

"The Ansayrii are a fine large race, with more bone and muscle than is generally found in orientals; browner than the Osmanli, but lighter, fairer than the Arab; brown hair is not by any means uncommon. The women, when young are handsome, often fair with light hair, and jet black eyes; or the rarer beauty of fair eyes and coal-black hair, or eyebrows; but exposure to the sun, and the labours they perform, soon wear them out.

"In dress the Ansayrii are Turks. According to the expression of the country they dress thus, as they regard white as their sacred colour, and deem it essential to be clothed in it. The white turban or cloth wrapped voluminously round the tarboosh, is worn by all.

"With the women the dress consists of the white cotton

shirt, hardly differing from the men, a zenaar, or belt, a jacket similar to that of the men, trousers resembling European trousers, save they are slightly fuller; a tarboosh and handkerchief on the head, or more generally a common handkerchief. They never conceal their faces, though they keep retired, except when the stranger is a guest in their houses, and then they will enter freely into conversation.

"The nation, for such it is, being capable of mustering forty thousand warriors able to bear arms, is divided into two classes, sheiks and people; the sheiks again into two, the sheiks, or chiefs of religion, Sheik el Maulen, and the temporal sheiks, or sheiks of government.

"The sheik of religion enjoys great privileges; as a boy he is taught to read and write; he is marked from his fellows from very earliest childhood, by a white handkerchief round his head. Early as his sense will admit he is initiated into the principles of his faith; in this he is schooled and perfected. Early he is taught that death, martyrdom, is a glorious reward, and that sooner than divulge one word, he is to suffer the case in which his soul is enshrined to be mangled or tortured in any way.

"During his priesthood he is strictly to conform to his faith. This forbids him not only eating certain things at any time, but eating at all with any but chiefs of religion; or eating anything purchased with unclean money; and the higher ones carry this to such an extent that they will only eat of their own produce; they will not even touch water, except such as they deem pure and clean.

"Like the Mohammedans, they practice the right of circumcision, performing it at various ages, according to the precocity of the child. The ceremony is celebrated, as among the Turks, with feasting and music.

"I do not yet know if any ceremony exists at the naming of the child. When a candidate is pronounced ready for initiation, his tarboosh is removed, and a white cloth wrapped round

his head. He is then conducted into the presence of the sheiks of religion. The chief proceeds to deliver a lecture, cautioning him against ever divulging their great and solemn secret. "If you are under the sword, the rope, or the torture, die and smile, you are blessed." He then kisses the earth three times before the chief, who continues telling him the articles of their faith. On rising, he teaches him a sign, and delivers three words to him. This completes the first lesson.

"They are allowed four wives. The marriage ceremony is simple, and divorce not permitted. If one of those four wives die, they are permitted to take another. Generally they have little affection for their wives—treating them rather as useful cattle than as rational creatures. They never teach women the smallest portion of their faith.

"Not only are the chiefs particular with regard to their food, but certain restrictions are observed among all. They will not eat or touch pig; they will not eat the meat of an ox or sheep that is blind or lame; some will not touch the meat of a female animal; fowls they eat; they will not eat the meat of an animal shot, unless killed afterwards: of gazelles, their only large animal, they will not eat the female; hares, and all animals that split the hoof, are forbidden; wine and spirits are permitted, but to drink either before Christians or Turks is a sin; while the chiefs only drink wine among themselves, and spirits before their co-religionists.

"They worship Ali. In one of their prayers they say:—'I declare I worship Ali, Ibn Abou Talib (the Ali of Mahommet), he is above all—a God Almighty.'

"They regard Mohammed el Hamyd as the prophet of God, and thus use the Mussulman confession, 'La illa ill Allah, Mohammed el Hamyd, Resoul el nebbi Allah;' but they omit all this when before Mohammedans.

"They believe in the transmigration of souls. Those who in this life do well, are hospitable, and follow their faith, become stars; the souls of others return to the earth, and become An-

sayrii again, until purified they fly to rest. The souls of bad men become Jews, Christians, and Turks, while the souls of those who believe not, become pigs, and other beasts.

"They pray five times a day, saying several prayers each time, turning this way or that, having no kebllah. If a Christian or a Turk sees them at their devotions, the prayers are of no avail. At their feasts they pray in a room closed and guarded from the sight or ingress of the uninitiated."*

No traveller previously to Mr. Walpole, with the exception of Burckhardt, having ever ventured on visiting the mountain villages of the Ansayrii, his account of this remarkable people is very valuable. "Most men (he says) are shy of approaching this district. Burckhardt spent one evening among them; but gives little information, save that on his mentioning having heard of a temple and people of their religion in the East Indies, they appeared much struck, as if there was something in it. In the first place they have no temple or building dedicated to prayer: and except vague stories, do not know whether they have any co-religionists or not."†

The Kaimakan of Latakia has the government of a great portion of the Ansayrii mountains. Among these mountains the taxes are seldom paid, except when a large force can be sent to collect them. There is no law but that of the strongest.

The Ansayrii call themselves Ibn Said Munen, and also Hydereer. The Arabic word "Munen" means belief.

The custom of planting groves over and near the tombs of saints, is practised by the Ansayrii in their mountains. Idolatry in all times has a penchant for perching itself in high places, and surrounding its tombs and sanctuaries with groves. They have the tombs of Mohammedan saints of the sect of Ali, which they hold in great veneration, and make pilgrimages to, and pray before. But their chief protector and patron is "Mohammed el Hamyd, whom Ali bless and consecrate."

Mr. Walpole, at the conclusion of the third volume of his

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii.

† Ib. p. 112.

work, comes to a conclusion respecting their religion by no means in accordance with the theory elsewhere adopted by him as to the Hivite origin of their idolatry:—"We shall, I think, find that this religion commenced as a mere sect of the Mussulmans, and that subsequent bitter persecution has led their sheiks or religious heads to deny all parts of the oppressors' creed, and to substitute fresh follies in their stead; that, in fact mysticism was heaped upon mysticism, till they themselves are puzzled in their belief."

A remarkable and accurate notice of the Ansyreeh appeared in an Arabic geography lately printed at Beirout, by the American missionaries. In this work the Ansyreeh are described as a branch of the Karmatian Arabs, whose tribe was located in the deserts of Cufa, of the Arabian Irak. Their name is derived from Karmath, a preacher of a new religion, who appeared at the close of the ninth century (æra of Hegira, 264). This man designated his doctrine "Batin," signifying "Interior," hence his followers were called Batineans. From this sect arose Nusair, an old man of great repute for holiness, for prayer, and fasting. He appointed twelve apostles to preach his doctrine. He was opposed by the sheiks of his tribe, imprisoned in Cufa, and delivered from it by the daughter of the jailor. On his liberation he gave out that he was brought out of prison by an angel. He wrote a book in which he said that he was divinely favoured and commissioned, had seen the Messiah—who is Ahmed, son of Mohammed, the son of Kanafeyah, son of Ali, and the same is Gabriel, the angel. It is said this new prophet went from Cufa into Syria, propagated his doctrines there, and finally disappeared, and was no more heard of.

Abulfeda, the Arab historian, on the authority of Ibn Saoud, says, "The Nusaireeh are called from Nusair, a companion of Ali, the son-in-law of Mohammed."

Pocock cites another Arab historian, who says, "the Ansyreeh are an extreme sect of the Schiites. They declare that God appeared in the form of Ali, and spoke by his mouth the doctrine of Batin."

The Rev. Samuel Lyde, in his work "The Ansyreeh and Ishmaeleeh; A Visit to the Secret Sects of Northern Syria." Lon. 8vo. 1858, says:—

"Of the early history of the Ansyreeh, very little is known; but their physiognomy and religion prove them to be of a distinct origin from the other races inhabiting Syria. They are supposed to be of the north of Syria, and to have remained in the mountain chain stretching across Mount Cassius to the Lebanon, while successive titles of conquest have swept along the plains on either side. At no period have they acquired celebrity as a people or sect. . . . It is difficult to ascertain exactly all the details of the religion of the Ansyreeh, both because their religion is a secret and ill digested one, and because there are few or none amongst them at the present day who understand it so well as to have fixed points of agreement and disagreement. However, there is one thing in which they all seem to agree, and which acts as a kind of freemasonry in binding together the scattered members of their body, namely, secret prayers, which are taught to every male child of a certain age, at stated times, in stated places, and accompanied with religious rites. The known part of their religion is a mixture of Mohammedanism, Magianism, Paganism, Judaism, and Christianity."*

Their religion received its Mohammedan tinge or at least the present form of it, from a man of the name of Nusairee, who came into Syria from Irak, in the early times of Mohammedanism, when numerous sects arose, and that of the Assassins became the most celebrated.

Mr. Lyde says "The Ansyreeh regard Christ as a prophet, and keep Christmas as a great festival, but their principal doctrines are those of Mohammedans of the sect of Ali. They practise circumcision, and hold some opinions in common with the Israelites. They are tinctured also with Sabeanism. The two sects into which they are divided, are called Shemseeh and

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii., p. 282.

Kumreeh, names taken from the words which designate the sun and moon.

"They hold the doctrine of transmigration of souls, derived from the Paganism of Hindostan; and with the ancient Canaanites they build the tombs of their saints and prophets (their sheiks) on high places, and in groves, which become places of pilgrimage and worship."

At Antioch a considerable portion of the trade is in their hands, and being entirely subject to the bigoted Moslems of that city, they feign to be Orthodox Mussulmans, and fast and pray as such, though it is well known by the Turks that they are not true believers. They are far more numerous, Mr. Lyde states, than the Druses, though of less influence. There is much disunion amongst them as a sect, and of hostility to the creeds of each other, though each holds a secret religion, and all have many doctrines in common. They are prone to ridiculing each other's tenets, or books as they are designated. There are large numbers of them in Tripoli and Kamah, but the great bulk are in Latakia, and the mountainous districts to the east of it. They are found as high as Tarsus, in Asia Minor. In the Mountainous districts they are generally called Fellaheen, or peasants. They seldom call themselves Ansyreeh, that term being used as one of reproach by the Turks. They are governed by their own sheiks or chiefs, called Mekuddams. It must be acknowledged that the works of travellers which put forth the most specific claims to a knowledge of the secret rites and doctrines of the Ansyreeh, Druses, and Metouali, leave us in the same ignorance of them in which they found us. The Rev. Mr. Lyde's work is, unfortunately, no exception to the rule.

CHAPTER IX.

The secret sects supposed to be derived from the Assassins—The Druses.

The origin of the Druses and the nature of their religion have long been themes of controversy, but rather subjects of speculation than research.

The writers who seem most favourable to this people in their views of the Druse character, are disposed to believe that their origin and religion have some christian elements in them, or that both present evidences of an admixture of paganism and Mohammedanism, purified or reformed in former ages to some extent; and consequently in their tendencies at the present time, that the Druses are more drawn towards Protestantism than any other sects in Syria, Christian or Mohammedan.

Other writers still more favourably disposed to the Druses, connect the origin of the Druses with the times and Christian warriors of the Crusades.

Men like Niehbur and Burckhart, who have travelled extensively in the East, thoroughly acquainted with the history of the people of the several countries they visited, afford the best information that can be obtained by inquiries on any subject analagous to the one in question.

"A man must carry knowledge with him (says Johnson), if he would bring home knowledge."

Those persons who have brought most knowledge to the assistance of the experience gained by travel, who seek for the truth irrespective of its bearings on the interest of their own

churches, or influences on their own national predilections, and have made this subject one of patient inquiry, will come to the conclusion that the Druses derive their origin from the Saracens, who settled in Syria during a term of 300 years ; that includes the existence of the power of the Caliphs from the period of the death of Mohammed, to the downfall of the last of his successors in the Caliphate; and that the Druses derive their religion from one of the earliest sects of Mohammedanism, the Karmatians, perpetrators of barbarous outrages and sanguinary atrocities, systematically effected, with one branch of which, the Ismalians, was connected the murderous tribe in Syria described by the early writers on the Crusaders as "Assasins."

The Druses of the present time ascribe their origin to the Saracens, who were followers of the sect of Ali, the founder of their faith, or one by whom it was settled into order, was a Caliph of Egypt called Hackheem or Hakim, who came on earth in the character of a Messiah. When the Messiah was assumed into the Deity, and was in heaven, a saintly person named Hamza was ordained by God to represent on earth the Lord Hakim, and to be the depository of the mysteries of his religion. This divine agent fled from Egypt into Syria, and took up his abode in the mountains of Lebanon. There he propagated the holy religion of Hakim with great success. He disappeared from earth, and another divine agent was sent forth named Moktaner, to carry on the work of Hamza. He was commissioned to preach the practical parts of religion contained in seven commandments, which enjoined on all true believers to observe truth, charity, renunciation of falsehood, confession of sins, submission to God's will. Steadfastness in the faith and proclamation of belief of this, being the only true and perfect religion.

The Druses occupy the whole of the southern range of the Lebanon chain, the western slope of Anti-Lebanon and G'bl-il-Sheikh, where they hold exclusive possession of upwards of forty towns and villages, and share two hundred with the

Maronites; while about eighty villages in other parts of Anti-Lebanon are peopled by them. Writers to whom their history is well known, assert that they owe their origin to a Persian, Mohammed Ben-Ismail-ed-Derazy, who settled in Egypt in 1017, and became such a fanatical disciple of that monster or madman, the Calif Hakem, that he was driven from the country and obliged to take refuge in the valley of Wady-el-Teim. Here he propagated his dogmas, which were afterwards modified by Hamza, whom the Druses venerate as their actual founder. This singular community have a dim, confused sort of belief in the unity of God and his manifestation of himself to men in the persons of seven individuals, the last of whom was Hakem, of infamous memory. They profess to believe in five spiritual angelic agencies. Their real tenets are not professed or revealed to any outside the circle of the initiated in their mysteries, of which their seems to be no doubt that idolatry enters into them, and that the secret worship of a calf forms one of their principal rites.

There is no evidence in the language, the physical aspect, or the manners and customs of the Druses, that they are of foreign extraction, or that they are even a distinct tribe. Their language is Arabic, without foreign idiom or accent; and their few peculiarities of dress and habits arise solely from the requirements of their faith.

According to their own traditions, the Druses believe that their ancestors originally dwelt upon that range of mountains situated between Laodicea and the extensive plains of the Amuk, and which are now exclusively inhabited by the fierce and little known Ansayrii tribes.

In 1811 the Druses were utterly expelled from this locality by the Ansayrii.

Upwards of fifteen hundred Druse families, the survivors of those who had been ruthlessly massacred, are said, upon this occasion, to have fled for protection and refuge to their fellow-religionists, dwelling on the Lebanon; and since that period it

is only in these parts exclusively that Druse settlements are to be encountered.

It fortunately happened for these refugees that some years previously there had been a considerable emigration of Druse families from the Lebanon, when nearly six hundred families migrated to the mountains of Houran, which border on the Syrian and Arabian deserts.

The towns held in peculiar estimation by the Druses of the Lebanon are the cities Ammatan and Bachlin. These are rallying points, where in time of warfare the tribes meet and swear allegiance to each other and their cause, in their places of worship. In these towns especially, the books of their faith are guarded religiously, and with jealous zeal. In Anti-Lebanon, Hasbeya and Rosheya answer the same purpose; and whenever anything is astir, anything going wrong, or any suspicion of danger is excited, from these places the news is telegraphed by bonfires throughout the Druse districts with extraordinary rapidity.

A singular custom prevails among the Druses. The higher order refuse to receive money or partake of food from the hands of strangers, lest such food or money should have come by improper means into the donor's hands. Consequently, when they have sums of money due to them for the produce of their vineyards, or for the sale of their silk crop, they employ a third party to change the money into other coin.

An astrologer, designated Sheik il N'goum, or the chief of the stars, usually accompanies the Druse sheik upon all visits of ceremony, or missions of importance, being invariably consulted upon all undertakings of moment.

The whole class admits of only two grand divisions, Akals, and D'ghahils, the former constituting that class that are supposed to be conversant with the Druse rites, the latter the common people.

Of the former division are the clergy and the learned doctors and elders; these superintend ordinances of worship,

and instruct the children in the elements of their religion. One distinguishing mark of this class is the extreme simplicity of their costumes, being forbidden to wear any article of gold or silk, whilst their language must be in accordance with their calling, profane or abusive language being strictly forbidden.

The Khalons or places of worship are usually situated apart from the villages, upon some commanding position. They take great care not to be disturbed or discovered by strangers while engaged in the secret duties of their religion.

In some of the larger and more important Khalons, the walls are decorated with the most grotesque specimens of rude art, highly coloured figures of men, women, children, birds, and beasts, wretchedly executed.

A law of divorce exists among them, but it is very seldom put into execution. If a wife leaves her husband's abode without an injunction to return again, this is tantamount to a divorce, and however willing both parties may be to re-unite, they cannot again be brought together, till the woman be first married again according to Turkish rites and ceremonials, to a third party, who must then divorce her, and after this she returns to her first husband.

The rite of circumcision is not practised by the Druses. But the most remarkable feature in the character of the Druse is, their appreciation of the rights and obligations of hospitality, which they look upon as being enjoined by their religion.

The Druses certainly inhabited Mount Lebanon, before the time of the first crusade, and were an independent and powerful tribe in the several periods of the Saracen, Frank, and Egyptian sway; and were never entirely subdued by any power, till about the year 1517.

About the year 1651 the members of the Shehaab family first began to assume the reigns of government among the Druses; and till the year 1841, with varying success, this family held sway in the Druse capital.

In 1668, Mohammed, Pacha of Constantinople was despatched with special instructions to the Lebanon, for the purpose of

effecting a better organization of the system of government; he established the seat of government at the favourite port of Sidon, which had then been famous as head-quarters for the crusading forces of the Franks.

In 1693 the Turkish Government waged war on the Druses, not with the sword, but with the nefarious policy that effects the same object as the weapon above named, by means of discord and disunion, the only sure method of weakening the strength of a strong tribe or faction.

In 1706 a young and inexperienced chieftain assumed the supreme command of the Druse tribes. As might have been expected, his youth and inexperience militated against his position, and the Turks were enabled by treachery and perfidy, to effect his ruin.

In the year 1741 the natives of Bekaa revolted against the Emir for having quartered a great number of troops upon them.

In 1748 the authority and power of the Lebanon Emir was augmented and confirmed by the Turkish authorities, who conferred upon him the government of Baalbec and the Bekaa.

In the year 1668 Daher, a powerful mountain sheik, carrying his independence further than it had ever been pushed by any of the Druse chieftains, obtained, by means of bribery and intimidation, the powerful position and titles of Sheik of Acre, Nazareth, Tiberias, Safat, and Galilee.

In 1788, Djezzar, Pachr, of infamous memory, named Shehaab, at that time a youth in the twenty fourth year of his age, Emir of the mountain, and supreme governor of the Lebanon. This prince was evidently a tool in the hands of Djezzar; who, with all his barbarity and cruelty, was a man possesed of considerable intellectual powers.

Djezzar being obliged, as was his annual custom, to accompany the Hadj for a certain distance on their pilgrimage, was compelled to leave the young Emir to sustain himself against formidable opponents; these opponents soon defeated him, but Djezzar, on his return from his pilgrimage, passed that way,

and took terrible vengeance on the enemies of his protegé. After an extensive massacre, he took effectual measures for completely subjugating the survivors, and broke down their independent church.

Maundrell, in 1697, visited the country of the Druses. In the third of an hour after his departure from Beyrout, he came to a plain extending about half a mile from the sea to the mountains. On the left hand was a small village, Sucfoat, belonging to the Druses, who possessd a tract of mountains as far as from Castravan to Carmel. Their present prince was an old man named Achmet, grand son to Faccardine, who kept up the prudent Druse custom of his ancestors of turning day into night. This practice was hereditary in his family, having learned from much sharp experience that Princes can never feel securely but by day, and cannot be too vigilant at night when people who are unawary and venture to sleep, may be made by a dagger or pistol, to sleep longer than was intended when they lay down.

"The Emir Faccardine, had his chief residence in this place. He was in the reign of Sultan Morat (Amurath), the fourth Emir or Prince of the Druses; a people supposed to have descended from some dispersed remainders of those Christian armies, that engaged in the crusades for the recovery of the Holy-Land; who afterwards being totally routed and despairing of a return to their native country again, betook themselves to the mountains hereabout: in which their descendants have continued ever since. Faccardine being (as I said) prince of these people, was not contented to be penned up in the mountains; but by his power and artifice, enlarged his dominions down into the plain all along the sea coast as far as from this place to Acre. At last the grand seignor growing jealous of such a growing power, drove the wild beast back again to the mountains from whence he had broke loose, and there his posterity retain their principality to this day."

Speaking of the inhabitants of the territories about Lebanon, Sandys says that, "they are of sundry nations and

religions, governed by a succession of princes, whom they call Emirs; descended, as they say from the Druses, the remainder of those French men which were brought into these parts by Godfrey of Bologne, who driven into the mountains above, and defending themselves by the advantages of the place, could never be utterly destroyed by the Saracens. At length they afforded them a peace and liberty of religion, conditionally that they wore the white turban, and paid such duties as the natural subject.

"But in tract of time they fell from the knowledge of Christ; and not thoroughly embracing the other, are indeed of neither. As for this Emir, he was never known to pray, nor ever seen in a mosque. His name is Faccardine; small of stature, but great in courage and achievement, about the age of forty, subtil as a fox, and not a little inclining to the tyrant. He never commenceth battle, nor executeth any notable design, without the consent of his mother."

The palace, as the abode of the Emir Bechir is called by Chasseaud, is thus described in his history of the Druses.

"Farchima is one of the most considerable villages situated on the Lebanon, comprising between three and four hundred houses and huts, of all sizes and description of architecture, and inhabited chiefly by Druses and Maronites. Very few of the habitations are mixed, the Druses who are the most numerous, occupying a distinct quarter of the village to that inhabited by the Maronites.

"We now proceed to enter the palace of the Emir, having first of all sent him word of our intention. Of the palace or its entrance gate, there is not much to be recorded; in any other large town of Syria, an ordinary caravansary might rival it in beauty of architecture and surpass it in strength; for this village, however, it is a prominent and remarkable edifice, fitted to be the habitation of a chief."

The Druses had attained the height of their power, when their

* Sandys travels in Turkey, Egypt, and the Holy Land in 1610., page 210.]

great captain and all his family were suddenly removed by the bowstring, after which the power of the Druse Emir was gradually reduced, till it became a mere shadow of what it had been.

In 1768, a Druse chief, named Daher, assumed the title of sheik of Acre, Nazareth, Tiberius, Safat, and Galilee, and routed all the Ottoman armies sent against him. In 1772, a revolution was effected in Egypt, many of the Druses were induced to join the Porte, and Sidon was besieged by the Turks and their new allies. Daher galloped to Acre, found there some Russian vessels of war, struck a bargain, and returned to wage a fierce contest with his foes. His Russian friends bombarded the Turkish towns; the Druses soon fell off from the Moslems, and Daher's star was once more in the ascendant. In 1775, Jaffa fell before the Egyptian troops, but the death of their commander stopped the progress of the victorious army. The Ottoman government still professed peace and friendship towards Daher, but suddenly bombarded Sidon with their fleet. The gallant chief, unprepared for this, was seeking present safety in flight, when he was shot dead by a peasant. Djezzar appointed the Emir Bechir Shehaab governor of the Lebanon, but it was long before the Druses would consent to acknowledge his authority, and not until their leader, Sheik Bechir Djonbelat, had been decapitated at Acre.

The Sheik Bechir was a Druse of extensive power at one time, greatly beloved by his people. The Emir, whose jurisdiction, when I first visited Syria in 1827, extended over all Mount Lebanon, was of a noble Turkish family from Mecca, a branch of which settled among the Druses, adopted their religion, which has continued from the time of the famous Fakardine to give rulers to Lebanon. The Emir, however, whether from policy or conviction, had turned Christian and had married one of his daughters to a converted Druse of the Maronite Catholic church. He affected however to fast the Ramazan in the presence of Turks, and like the Druses pretended to be a Mussul-

man when in Mohammedan society, and at a later period of his life adopted the religion of the Maronites.

Perhaps his chief motive for embracing Christianity was to attach to him the Christian population of the Lebanon who are more numerous than the Druses.

When the Emir Bechir was the Lord of the Lebanon previously to 1840 he could boast of his ability to bring thirty thousand Druses armed with muskets into the field. The Druse population was then estimated at two hundred thousand. The main industry of this people was silk weaving, and the number of looms at which they worked was very considerable, as many as twenty have been seen working in a single street of a Druse village.

The chief Druse districts in the Lebanon are Arkoub, Hoof, Shebba, Garb, Mattu, and the seat of their Emirs Dair el Kamr. They inhabit districts likewise in Haouran, Ante-Lebanon. In 1845, when Warburton published "The Crescent and the Cross," he estimated the total number of the Druses at 120,000 The Emir Bechir and his three sons were then in exile, and his power was in the hands of the Emir Saladin of Habeysha. It is a curious circumstance, that when Warburton's work was published all the Emirs or Princes of Lebanon, whether of the Christian, Maronite, or Osmanli Metouali, acknowledged the Emir Bechir as supreme and kissed his hands.

The Emir Bechir, however, in case of war, had not the power of summoning the dependents of the inferior Emirs to accompany him in battle; he had to apply to the inferior Sheiks of Mokaddems who seldom refused to furnish their contingent.

The Emir Bechir had the power of life and death, which now wisely is restricted to the Sultan.

Now all the Emirs of the mountains are nominally subject to the Pacha of Damascus. The Emir Bechir, it would appear from Warburton, was not the first Druse of his race who turned Christian to conciliate the Maronites. Some of his

Druse ancestors, it seems, had conformed to Christianity from like considerations. The Emir Bechir used to boast that he could bring 15,000 men into the field at a few hours' notice. In a short time after he made this boast, he was powerless, proscribed, and persecuted, in exile, and never destined to return to his country.

When Ibrahim Pacha met resistance at the hands of the inhabitants of the Lebanon, he demanded that the mountaineers should be disarmed. The Maronites complied; but the Druses resisted, and, notwithstanding the power and energy of their new masters, most of them retained their weapons. This gave them a great advantage over the Christians, which they have ever since maintained. The Egyptians were driven out by the English forces in 1840; and the aged Emir Bechir was deprived of his government and banished. A ruinous policy was now adopted for the government of Lebanon. It was divided into two sections; over the one was placed a Druse chief, and over the other a Christian, both being subject to the Pacha of Sidon. A fair field was thus opened for giving full scope to jealousies, bitter hatred, and smothered feuds of centuries. Each sect, under its own leader, watched a favourable opportunity to assail the other. The Turkish Pacha, feeling his inability to control the warlike mountaineers, stirred up their mutual jealousies, and in the wars of 1841 and 1845 succeeded in desolating a great part of Lebanon by fire and sword. When both Maronites and Druses were sufficiently weakened, the Turks tried to disarm them; but this, so far as the Druses were concerned was a failure. In one thing, however, the Turks did not fail. They did not fail in destroying the roads constructed by the old Emir; in ruining his beautiful palaces; in effectually checking that agricultural industry and commercial enterprise which he had originated, and which the Egyptians fostered; in handing over life and property throughout the whole mountain to the tender mercies of every armed vagabond; and in kindling such deadly hatred in the breasts of the rival sects as must eventually make the Lebanon a wilderness.

"*It is greatly to be regretted that this plan of divided rule was adopted chiefly through the influence of England. No plan could be more fatal to the prosperity of the mountains, or the peace of its inhabitants. And so long as it is persisted in, war and bloodshed must continue.*"

This opinion, be it observed, is expressed by an author of eminence in a late article on the Syrian Massacre in one of our principal Quarterly Reviews.

Chasseaud, in his History of the Druses, makes the following observations on the Egyptian occupation of Syria, and the part taken by the Druses in relation to it:—"All the intermittent forays, expeditions and invasions undertaken from time to time against the Druses by the Turkish troops, have been made in vain; they have produced no durable results. Their effects have never been more than temporary and transient; and wonderful is the recuperative energy of the Druse mountaineers. Nor was the best of Egyptian Generals, Ibrahim Pacha, more successful in his attempts to subdue the Druses, during his famous Syrian campaigns. With all the prestige of his great success and powerful name—with all his daring and skill, and the formidable numbers of trained Egyptian soldiers under his command, he was unable to reduce the Druse mountains to subjection. The proud spirit of too bold a people opposed his every effort. Deeply imbued with the heroic traditions of their ancestors, and loving their freedom as they loved the breeze of their own mountains, the Druses met all his assaults with noble courage; they clung to their native heights with the most desperate tenacity, and even when temporarily overpowered, they seemed to bend before the greater strength brought to bear upon them, the fire of their resistance only smouldered, to burst forth again with renewed ardour on the first opportunity. Notwithstaning Ibrahim Pasha's conquest of every part of Syria, it is notorious that the Druses, although overcome for a time, remained virtually unvanquished. They never endured the thraldom which the son of Mohammed Ali so fiercely imposed upon neighbouring races. Indeed that

dreaded Egyptian Prince gave proof of more diplomatic expediency and pliability of temper in their regard, than was his custom to exhibit towards others; for he shewed an unusual readiness to adapt himself as much as possible to the peculiarities of the mountain chieftains.

In short, Ibrahim Pacha never was in a position to declare himself conqueror of the Druse tribes.

"A remarkable incident, however, in which the Druses were concerned, occurred at the time of his evacuation of Syria, and it will always remain to the indelible discredit of a man, who, in other respects was a brave soldier. The circumstance which I am about to mention, evinced on the part of Ibrahim Pacha, an unscrupulous, cruel, and pitiless despotism. At the period when Sir Charles Napier was in possession of the seaport towns of Beyrout and Sidon, he communicated with the Druse chief, at that time the Christian Emir Bechir, and demanded the help of the mountain tribes to aid the British arms against the Egyptian usurper. This summons of Sir Charles Napier came to the knowledge of Ibrahim Pacha, and he instantly sent a short, fierce message to the Emir, and to all the chiefs connected with the Lebanon, declaring that if one single man amongst them should make the slightest attempt to aid the English in resistance of Egyptian authority, such a step would be tantamount to signing the death warrant of every Druse in his power, for all of them should be immediately put to death. Now, at that very moment the sons and nephews of the Emir Bechir himself were actually serving under the Egyptian general, and were, of course, at his mercy."*

In 1834 the Emir Bechir had been incited by the English consular authorities to get his Druses to go to war with Ibrahim Pacha, and to join the insurrection that had been got up in the Lebanon against Ibrahim Pacha, and his Egyptian forces.

The old Emir Bechir, in his 77th year, was induced to sur-

* Chasseaud's History of the Druses of the Lebanon.

render himself into the hands of the Turkish government in 1841, by the English authorities in the Levant.

This act, exceedingly impolitic as well as unjust, has not been forgotten, and never will be forgiven in Syria. MacFarlane has given an interesting account of an interview with the old Emir, "the most venerable man he ever saw," then in his 83rd year, at Brusa, the place of banishment assigned to him.

The Emir stated to MacFarlane that the English Consul-general of ———, and another British consul in Syria, had been the cause of his ruin; they had betrayed him. "He maintained that he never had been in rebellion against the Sultan; that the Porte had driven him into perilous enterprizes, and then abandoned him to those whose enmity he had provoked by their command. That in the year 1834, they had excited him and his subjects, the Druses, to join in the insurrection against Mohammed Ali, the Pacha of Egypt, and that on that luckless occasion, being left without the support the Turks had promised him, he had been defeated by Ibrahim Pacha and compelled to submit to the Egyptian rule; that in 1840, when the four great powers of England, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, resolved that the whole of Syria and Palestine should be restored by force of arms to the young Sultan, he had been visited by English as well as by Turkish agents, and by them impelled to rise up against the Egyptians."

Accordingly he and the Druses joined in the movement against the Egyptians. That movement failed, and they were compelled to submit to the Egyptian rule, because they could no longer resist Ibrahim Pacha.

When the Egyptians were driven out of Syria, the old Emir was induced to seek refuge on board an English vessel of war. He was taken to Malta, remained there eleven months, and was well and hospitably treated. At the end of that time, the Emir was informed by the English authorities, he must go to Constantinople, and confide in the magnanimity and mercy of the Sultan. He went, depending, however, wholly on the protection of the British minister, and, as he states, he received no

protection from him or his representatives there. The Turkish Government sent orders to him to quit the capital with all his family (including several sons) and retinue, and proceed to a town in the vicinity of Erzeroum, in Asia Minor.

The old Emir demurred in vain; he was told by some officials that if he did not obey the orders given him, "they would drag him away by his white beard." After long sufferings in the place of exile he was first sent to, he was removed to Brusa, and an allowance given to him of 10,000 piastres a month, which up to the time of MacFarlane's visit (1847) had been regularly paid.

Speaking of his misfortunes to MacFarlane, he said, "I was a free man in my mountains, surrounded by my faithful and brave people, and none would have brought me from them by force: neither English, nor Austrians, nor Turks, nor Egyptians would have dared to march into my country. I was deceived, cajoled, and entrapped by English agents! I went voluntarily down to the coast and on board an English man-of-war, and then I found that I was a prisoner!"

The old man made some melancholy allusions to his ruined fortunes, and those of his people. He said, "Well the Turks have had their way. I and all my family are their captives; but what have they gained by it? They have turned my pleasant palace into a barrack, they have stabled their horses in my kiosks, they have destroyed everything and carried off all that was mine. But can they call Mount Lebanon their own? Has the country been quiet a single day since they bore me from it?"*

MacFarlane cannot understand what business England had in interfering, or interest it had in overthrowing, the dynasty of the Emir Bechir, "which had existed from the time of the crusades, and had ruled in mount Lebanon before Osman laid the foundation of the Ottoman Empire at Brusa.

At these interviews of Mac Farlane, with the old Emir Bechir,

* Turkey and its Destiny. vol, 2, p. 69.

the prince of the Druses of the Lebanon, he always observed there was present an aged clergyman, "an orthodox Roman Catholic Priest," who had lived in Italy, spoke Italian perfectly, and French tolerably well. The priest belonged to the Emir's household, and evidently exercised considerable influence over the Emir, and must have lived a long time with him to be so well informed on subjects relating to the Lebanon and the Druses, as he appeared to be in the conversation between Mac Farlane and the Emir, in which he joined. MacFarlane ob-observes—"There seemed to be a curious intermixture of religions. The Padre was strictly an orthodox Roman Catholic Priest. The Emir, who in the Lebanon, had ruled over Christians as well as Druses, was said to be half Druse, half Christian; and of his people now with him, some were a sort of Christians, some were Mussulmans, and some strict Druses. I had no opportunity of making inquiries about this last mysterious sect, its tenets and its rites. I only remembered that the Emir's grandson told me that the Druses worshipped the image of a calf which was always enclosed in an ark."

Lord Lindsay, in his excellent "Letters on Egypt, Edom and the Holy Land," in 1836 and 1837, vol. 11, p. 131, gives an account of the Druses he met with in some of the villages of Gebel Nauran. Many of the towns, he says, exclusively inhabited by Druses kindred to those of Lebanon, they appeared to him the most superior race in the country. Their Sheiks and aged people, were always well dressed; their women neatness itself in their attire, with their white veils pendent from a silver horn projecting from the forehead, reminding one of the Coiffure en pain de Sacre of the 14th and 15th century in France and England, the same fashion of a head gear that we read of in the scriptures in Edom and the Holy Land 4,000 years ago. Lord Lindsay says this silver horn on the head is still the principal ornament of the fair sex christians, as well as Druses in Mount Lebanon. I think his Lordship is mistaken with respect to the use of the silver horn by the Christian women of Lebanon.

The capital of the Druses in the Haouran is Sueda.

The principal Druse villages on the Lebanon are Moushmoushi, Baiteer, Aumatour, Muktara, Halouét, Deiril-Kamar, Bêt-il-Deen, Backleen, K'flnebra, Ain Anoob, Aitat, Shouafat, B'humdoon, Arayiah, K'farchima, and Mansourie, lying between Sidon and Beyrout, where the Druses are far more numerous. To the north-east of Beyrout are Brummana, Corneille, Mittaine, Shouaer, Boukfaia, and Solima, and the village of Souyre, in the Anti-Lebanus, which is exclusively inhabited by Druses.

The mountain called Gebel El Sheik is supposed to be the highest mountain in these parts, its summit being perpetually covered with snow.

Under the sway of the Druse Emir at Rashia, is another unimportant Druse village, an hour and a half distant from one of more consideration called Haimte. The most striking feature of this latter village is the fact that its Druse inhabitants appear strictly to adhere to the tenets of the Mohammedan law, being scrupulous in their attendance to rites and ceremonials, and governed by a Turkish Dervish conjointly with their own peculiar sheik.

About an hour distant from Haimte, situated to the left of a beacon track, are Denibi and Mimis; whilst further on and to the right is Seffa; all three Druse villages.

Three hours further, and in a direct course south, we pass Ain Ephjer; and after riding two hours over a desolate country we reach the village of Hasbeia, situated on the top of a mountain.

Hasbeia contains nearly eight hundred houses, it is the residence, at some seasons of the year, of the Greek patriarch of Damascus; and is governed by a Druse Emir, subject to the authority of the Pasha of Damascus. Its inhabitants are of mixed creeds, but by far the greater proportion are Druses.

"After Hasbeia, and close to the village of Banias, which is dependent upon it, is the village Medjal, situated on the summit of a mountain of considerable elevation, and inhabited

principally by Druses, the proportion of Christian families being only as one to a hundred.

The Druses of this village, in common with most of those inhabiting the country about the neighbourhood of Damascus, pretend to be disciples of the Mohametan faith, strictly observing the Ramazan fast. Some of these very people have been known even to profess Christianity so far as to employ the services of a Latin Monk, whilst at the same time, on every occasion of their visiting Damascus, they attended the Mosques there publicly.

At Latakia, the Hon. Mr. Walpole says, the following statement was given to him respecting some religious rites of the Druses. No authority is given for this statement; I do not therefore attach much value to it, but as Mr. Walpole thought it worth while to give insertion to it in a work of no small merit, I refer to it: "The other day at dinner the following story was related:—A Christian peasant being anxious to witness the worship of the Druses, laid himself in a window-hole, whence he could not be seen. Presently the Druses assembled, and sitting down, recited several prayers; then they produced a figure. One said, "You are God who made the world; who made so and so, who did so and so. You let the Druses be beaten and gave them up to the Turks. Now, save yourself." And the figure was handed over to others who soundly flogged it. Another was produced, "You are the Saviour, the Son of God. You have brought more trouble, wars, fights, on the earth than aught else. Save yourself." And this idol was handed over, and treated like the first. Another was produced, "You are Mahomet, and what have you done? We owe you wars, fightings—our tyrants, our persecutors. Hand him over." And he was whipped. Another was produced, "You are Providence. Now see what you can do. Save yourself."

A very important and authentic original Arabic document—

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. iii, p. 90.

an account of, or rather interpretation of the sacred writings in which the mysteries and doctrines of the Druses are contained —was procured by Mr. G. W. Chasseaud, a native of Beyrout, in Syria, in 1851, in a village of the Lebanon named Hadded. A translation of this document is given by Mr. Chasseand, in a very interesting work of his, entitled "The Druses of Lebanon," published in 1855. Of Mr. Chasseaud's trustworthiness and knowledge of the Arabic language, no doubt can be entertained. He is a member of a highly respectable family, with some of whom I was acquainted in Syria many years ago.

The document above referred to, is divided into eighteen chapters, and occupies thirty-two pages. The doctrines therein illustrated are unquestionably those of many of the Sheoniite sects of Mohammedanism, whose disciples uphold the sanctity and superior spiritual excellence of Ali, as of a far higher order than those of Mohammed; and, what is particularly remarkable, who connect the names and acts of the seven orthodox Imaams, the 6th of whom was Ishmael Ebn Jaffar, with the present rites and priests of the Druses.

In the first chapter entitled, "A short explanation of the ocean of Time," there is a luminous account *(lucus a non lucendi)* of the creation of the world and all things in it.

The second chapter informs us, "The souls that have been created in the world (that is of all mankind), were numbered from the beginning, and have never diminished or increased, and will remain so for all eternity."

Again in the same chapter, "The bodies of these souls are all corruptible, but the souls themselves are incorruptible and unchangeable, shifting from one man or beast to another, and never differing from what they were and continue to be."

The third chapter gives an account of creative energies, the labors of seven original spirits deriving aid from the creator, and giving their aid to Chaor, whereby the seven planets were organised. "These seven planets amongst the interior economy of the earth, and all that happens to the animal or vegetable and mineral creation, is through the agency

of these seven stars, or *planets:* fortune and misfortune are ruled by them."

Chapter 4th tells us "The Amighty creator had compassion on the *people*, and granted them those specific orders.

And those specific orders are the borders, or order of truth and the order of falsehood."

Chapter 5th says, "The division of the righteous people was predestined from that very beginning to happiness and good.

The division of those who are born to perdition, was predestined to disobedience from the beginning to the very last day."

The 6th chapter tells us "This Pronouncer of invitation," was wont to declare himself a prophet, and one based upon a solid foundation. He was also wont to rise upon the people with a sword, and with compulsion, in order to force them to embrace his law.

After the death of this eloquent one, his creed was propagated on the confines of Truth, in order to explain the meaning of the descent from heaven.

And this eloquent one established himself, an inward or secret law,—and was possessed of sufficient knowledge of the true law to base his own creed thereon.

After the passing away of the supporter of this *eloquent one*, the seven priests arose and embraced his law."

In the same chapter we are informed, "Then appeared the creator in uncovering the glory and shame of the Amr, and established the all powerful Ali, to reveal his Unity and the extent of his power, to establish prayer, to separate knowledge, to give laws, to establish decrees, and to refer to the promises and the promised."

Chapters 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11, are a tissue of verbose absurdities.

Chapter 12th tells us "Now, when Jesus, the son of Joseph, appeared with the New Testament, and established himself as the Lord, the Messiah, who is Jesus, (the peace of God be upon him!) he was accompanied by his four apostles, John, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, (the peace of God upon them!) and

the people of truth profited by his revelations, although they pretended to the truth, in the law, and copied the law of Moses in explaining the law of Jesus."

Again in the same chapter, "After this Mohammed, the son of Abdalla, appeared with his law, which is the law of Islam.

And Mohammed established Ebn Abou Taleb, as his supporter, and all the disciples of truth followed the law of Islam, as they had done every other law that had preceded it."

And in the same chapter, "The time of Mohammed Ebn Abdalla, was more evident and more demonstrative of power than all the epochs that preceded him; consequently, they pretended for singleness in Ebn Abou Taleb, moreover because the prophets Noah, Abraham, Moses, and Jesus, foretold the appearance of a man, the highest of the high, whose rank is great, whose name be glorified!

This was Ali Ebn Abou Taleb.

When the term of the priesthood of Mohamed Ebn Abdalla, was completed, Mohamed Ebn Ismail, the prophet, appeared, whose law is the final of all laws inciting to the right path; and he is from the seed of Ali Ebn Taleb.

And to Mohamed Ebn Ismail there is a supporter secretly established in Paradise, and no one knows his name, because he does not appear in the manifestation of the law which we have."

Chapter 13th informs us "When Mohamed Ebn Ismail appeared, and introduced his law, the disciples of Truth believed in his law and his prophecies, and they recognised his excellence and his supporter, who was Sayeed il Muhdi Ebn Ahmed.

And it is through Mohamed ebn Ismail and his supporter, that are made perfect the perfect in eloquence, the holy men, and the priesthood.

Then the power of Mohamed passed to his descendants, who are the priests the respected, until it reached Sayeed il Muhdi, and from Sayeed il Muhdi, it passed to others in seclusion, and ultimately appeared openly, in the kingdom, and in the government, through Kaem, Mansoor, Maaz, Azeez, and Hakem, the

eternal, the assisted, the cherished, the beloved, and the governor."

Chapter 14th tells us "in the preaching of the Lord the Messiah, no manifestation takes place; for Jesus said unto the people, "My time is not consummated; after me will appear a director who is prevented from coming at this time."

And the creator, may he be praised! manifested himself corporeally, in the time of the fourth Heaven, in Abdalla Ebn Abmed, under the name of Ali; he is the exalted over all exalted, unto whom belongeth the right of command.

He also manifested himself corporeally in the time of the fifth Heaven, which is Mohamed Ebn Abdalla, under the name of Maal.

The appearing of Maal (may he be honoured and glorified!) was in the country of Tadmor to the East, and his appearance was extremely beautiful and glorious, and he was most rich, and travelled alone with one thousand camels laden with goods and merchandise.

The duration of Maal the exalted, lasted until the time of the fifth priest was completed, who is Mohammed, the aforesaid.

After him appeared his son Hussein, who is the sixth Heaven, and after Hussein, his son Abdalla il Muhdi, who is called Ebn Ahmed, but who should be called Muhdi, and after him Sayeed il Muhdi, who is the seventh from among the prophets.

The creator again manifested himself under the name of Kaem, as an infant, and in appearance as the son of Maal."

The 16th chapter informs us "At the close of the time of the Almighty Kaem, the creator most praised, manifested himself bodily and in the priesthood of Mansoor, and it was apparently visible that he was son of Il Kaem, and that Il Kaem had transferred upon him the priesthood, and had clothed him with the Cailifat, and assigned his power to him.

And the faith of Mansoor was promulgated all over the earth, and made known to all assemblies, and Mansoor performed miracles, and changed some of the articles of the law, as the

Almighty Kaem had also done before him, and his priesthood took place in the county of the West."

The 18th chapter tells us "Then the Almighty withdrew himself, and then appeared upon earth an evil spirit, and this evil spirit remained on earth seven years, and his limits were from Antioch to Alexandria.

And the companies of this evil spirit were tempting the Unitarians, of whom they gained a great number, both men, women, and children."

Again in the same chapter, "Then appeared my Lord Bohaddeen, and he was possessed of "the order of Truth"; and Moktanna Bohaddeen was the last that appeared, after him no laws remained uncompleted; he fulfilled the creation, and completed the conversion of the people, and delivered the rest of the Unitarians."

In the same chapter we are told, "And when Moktanna disappeared, he published his noble epistle, with the epistles of Il Kaem, and the epistles of Hamza, the wisdom of Unitarianism, which epistles shewed that these noble persons appeared personally, and set down a law, which law teaches us to know the laws, the beginning, the end, the promise, the threat, the reward, the punishment, the past and future,"

Abstract of what it is necessary for a Unitarian to know, believe and observe, taken briefly from the book of the law. "It is necessary that the Unitarian should possess the knowledge of four things:—

1.—The knowledge of our Lord God (may his name be exalted!).

2.—The knowledge of Il Kaem.

3.—The knowledge of the Prophets.

4.—The knowledge of those virtues which it is necessary to observe."

It is also necessary to believe in God in his human form, without asking questions of—Where? or how much? or who? that the same figure of the deity has no flesh, no blood, nor body, nor weight.

It is necessary the Unitarians should believe in God represented by the ten directors—Ali, El Bar, Zacharias, Elias, Maal, El Kaem, Mansoor, Maaz, Azees, and Hakem.

The highest Director was all his time invisible, and there was no priesthood with him. El Bar was also invisible in the priesthood.

After El Bar, appeared Adam El Gerone, who is Enoch.

After him appeared seven priests from "The order of Truth," who followed his steps; and after them appeared the givers of laws, Noah, Abinham, Moses, Jesus, Mohamed, Mohamed the 2nd and Said El Mokti, and these were all one soul. Then the priesthood reached its rightful owner, Kaem Hamza Ebn Ali.

It is necessary to possess the knowledge of the seven laws, viz:—The truth of the Tongue or belief in the divinity of El Hakem, in the priesthood of Kaem (Hamza), in the true prophets, priests, and leaders, the true religion. Also in the Transmigration of souls from one body to another, in the resurrection of the dead, and in future rewards and punishments.

Secondly—The knowledge of the preservation of friendship between brothers—which means to recognise their ranks, to love them whether far or near, to be humble before superiors, to treat well those who are low in rank amongst us, to support them both. Secretly and publicly to give them their due rights temporal or spiritual, and to regard them as friends.

Thirdly—*The abandonment of the doctrine of idols, being the abandonment of the doctrine of those who believe in the Tanzeel* (the Koran), and those who believe in the traditions, and who make Ali Ebn Abou Taleb like unto God, and say that God is not one.

Fourthly—The knowledge of the abandonment of evil spirits, which means disbelief in devils and deceivers, and those who belong to the order of deceivers.

Fifthly—The knowledge of the worship of one God; which signifies belief in God's sole essence, being invisible, without substance, weight, or form.

Sixthly—The knowledge of being satisfied with the acts of God, implying resignation to his laws.

Seventhly—The knowledge of submission to his will; implying obedience, patience, dutifulness.

And these are the Seven Laws which belong to the Unity: and "The truth of the tongue" is instead of prayer; and "The perseverance of friendship between brothers" is instead of giving alms; and "The abandonment of the worship of idols" is instead of fasting; and "The disbelief in evil spirits" is instead of the "Proofs;" and "The acknowledgment of Our Lord" is instead of the "Two Proofs;" and "To be satisfied with his acts" is instead of warfare; and "The resignation to his will" is instead of authority.

The conclusion is—that whosoever knows and believes in what has preceded, and is sound of mind and body, and of full age, and free from servitude, will be of those who are destined to the privileged ranks, and entitled to be present at the private assemblies, at which whosoever is present will be saved by Almighty God, and whosoever is absent will repent. May God facilitate his ways of good, and pour upon us his blessing! He is the Assistant, the Giver of Victory, the Wise and the Experienced! Amen." *

Such is the religion of the Druses, of which the preceding account is, in all probability, the most reliable that exists. On its own showing it is a confused disjointed mass of Paganism, heterodox Mohammedanism, and corrupted Christianity.

The total Druse population may exceed 80,000 souls; some say 100,000. Of these, some 70,000 are concentrated in the southern division of Mount Lebanon, and round the base of Hermon. In Haurân, the ancient Bashan, there are 7,000 or 8,000; and in Jabel el-Ala a few hundred families still remain.

I have elsewhere had to notice a very remarkable leading article in the "Times," on the Syrian Massacres, beginning with the enquiry,—"What are we to do with the Druses?"

The well-informed writer of that article tells his readers truly:—

* Chasseaud's "Druses of the Lebanon."

"The great Druse Chief, Mohamed-el-Nasar, the instigator of the recent butcheries, proclaims openly his contempt of the Sultan, and defies retaliation. This man is a curious specimen of a savage, with just a smack of European ideas, and just enough knowledge of European politics to set him on a wrong tack, and add to his brutality the inspiration of conceit. He sets up as something of a gentleman, and cultivates English acquaintance, so far as a fortress in the mountain enables him to do so. His fortress itself has pretensions to being a palace, and exhibits corridors and galleries, marbles and gilding. He has entertained English travellers quite lately in this embellished chateau, and he does us the honour to have a mighty respect for us. But there is something irreclaimable about this savage; he gets a smattering of the talk of European life, and scrapes up a few facts about governments and the politics of different states, but they are not incorporated in his mind, and never once mingle with his real vein of intellect, which is entirely savage, exhibiting the cunning which can unthread the windings of tribe or clan politics tolerably well, contrive a combination of mountain heads, and scheme an onslaught, but is utterly incapable of grasping a single fact out of its own accustomed sphere. The civilisation of these men is only skin deep, and what they know about us, their European stock of ideas, stick like so much plaster upon the wild aboriginal intellect, with which it refuses to amalgamate, and of which it is only an unsightly, discordant outside decoration. . . . . The only use to which, it seems, Mohammed has turned his knowledge of the civilized world, is to start the idea that a massacre of the Maronites would be extremely grateful to England, as being a blow to French interests in Syria. That is just the sort of truth which a barbarian acquires from a smattering of Western life and politics. He only sees things really in the light in which his savage nature reveals them, and his knowledge immediately joins the barbaric material within, is enlisted in its service, and aids in its forcible development. This man, it appears, really fancied himself an

European politician, and thought that he had the head of a cabinet statesman on his shoulders in planning this desperate and horrible scheme of Christian massacre. He counted on English support, and therefore, it need not be added, on an English reward. He had, doubtless, before him the vision of an expanded and exalted tribe—of an alliance of England and the Druses, which would bring the latter out of their barren fastnesses, and introduce them to the luxury and capital of the world; and, finally, of himself mounting upon his tribe's success, and becoming a great man and head of the English party in Syria."

But the writer of the "Times" has not told us who the parties are who have put these things into the heads of the Druse chiefs? Who are the Europeans who have put these false ideas into the minds of the great Druse chief Mohamed-en-Nasar and his compeers, the instigators of those butcheries of Roman Catholic Christians, "that a massacre of Maronites would be extremely grateful to England, as being a blow to French interests in Syria?"

My answer to these enquiries is—the persons who are answerable, to a very considerable extent, for these atrocities are those exceedingly indiscreet persons connected with our Bible Societies and Consular Agencies in Syria, of whose imprudent, unauthorised, and, if it were not for their mischievous, I would say, bombastic and ridiculous correspondence and personal communications with these sanguinary, idolatrous barbarian chiefs. Of the amicable relations of those persons with the Druses, and the assurances given by them of the deep interest taken in England in all that concerns their welfare, and of the respect in which their noble character and their valour is held there, we have many samples in the late Parliamentary Papers on the Syrian Disturbances.

It really is time to put an end to this scandalous abuse of missionary influence and consular power in Syria—to keep British imperial interests wholly separate and apart from these miserable contests and controversies, which lead to terrible

calamities and the effusion of so much Christian blood. Till this is done, the influence and power exercised by our Ambassador at the Porte will be misconceived, misrepresented, and misconstrued by the representatives of other European sovereigns. This has been the case already with regard to our interference with the Porte in behalf of one of those instigators of the late massacres.

The Druse Chief Seyd Bey, or Said Bey Hyemblat, was one of those pet anti-Christian barbarians, the result of whose intercourse with our countrymen is so graphically described in "The Times" article I have just referred to.

In a letter published in the London papers, and commented on freely in some French journals, dated from Constantinople, 23rd March, 1861, we read: "At the instance of Sir H. Bulwer, the Porte has consented not to execute the Druse chief Seyd Bey Hyemblat. No decision has as yet been given on the demand of the majority of the International Commissioners for the execution of Koorschid and Tahir Pachas. The execution is, however, not likely to take place."

The most powerful of the Druse chiefs in Lebanon were the following: Sheik Said Hyemblat, called, from his great wealth, the "Purse of the Druses." He held an influential post under the Turkish Government, as Head of Police in the district of Mukhtarah. He appears to have played an atrocious part in the late outbreak—openly professing a desire for peace, but secretly stirring up his men to wholesale murder. He was brought to trial by Fuad Pacha, convicted, and sentenced to death; but, by the indefatigable exertions of Lord Dufferin, the British Commissioner, this chief, and all the other convicted Druse chiefs, have had their sentences commuted, or been liberated.

CHAPTER X.

The Metoualis.

The Metoualis of the Lebanon are heterodox Mohammedans, of a very loose character in faith and morals. They call themselves orthodox Osmanlis, but they are of the Schiite sect of Ali. Wild, uncivilised people, they are the least numerous of the inhabitants of the Lebanon. Their numbers now hardly exceed 20,000. They inhabit Askalon, Sidon, Baalbec, and the mountainous district of Diebet.

Lieutenant Burton, in his "Travels in the Hedjaz, or a Pilgrimage to Mecca and Medina," conjectures that the Metoualis of Syria are identical with a race of Arabs—the Nahhawilah people—of permanent bad fame in their locality, who dwell in Mecca, separate from the other inhabitants. These people are of a sect, or rather a branch, in particular bad odour, of Schiites, followers and venerators of Ali. They hold the doctrine of the transmigration of souls, and are reproached with holding opinions and principles remarkable for their perversity, such as community of women. They curse the Sonnites and their venerated Caliphs, and have their own priests and teachers, resembling strikingly, in many particulars, the Metoualis, according to Burton; but, as I think, still more the Druses.

Dr. Thompson, a Protestant missionary, long and intimately

acquainted with the Metoualis (whom he designates Metâwelis), thus speaks of this community:—

"This people are fearfully profane. Everybody curses and swears when in a passion. No people that I have ever known can compare with these Orientals for profaneness in the use of the names and attributes of God. The evil habit seems inveterate and universal. When Peter, therefore, began to curse and to swear on that dismal night of temptation, we are not to suppose that it was something foreign to his former habits. He merely relapsed, under high excitement, into what, as a sailor and a fisherman, he had been accustomed to all his life. The people now use the very same sort of oaths that are mentioned and condemned by our Lord. They swear by the head, by their life, by heaven, and by the temple, or, what is in its place, the church. The forms of cursing and swearing, however, are almost infinite, and fall on the pained ear all day long.

"If the laws of Moses concerning things and persons unclean were intended to keep the Jews from mingling with the surrounding nations, nothing more effectual could have been devised for this purpose. I know by experience that it even renders it very unpleasant to reside in a Metâwely village, and is an effectual barrier against forming any intimate relations with them. You never contract friendships with persons who will neither eat, drink with, nor visit you, and into whose houses you cannot enter without contracting or imparting defilement. The law must be broken down before people thus situated can either unite in religious ceremonies or contract family alliances. These Metawelies do thus live separated, both in fact and feeling, from their neighbours, hating all, hated by all. Of course, they refuse to eat with all classes except themselves; and so it was with the Jews."

Dr. Thompson goes on to point out striking resemblances in their customs, prejudices, some of their rites, and in the contour and expression of their features, with those of the Jews.

"Their rules," he says, "are exactly the same as those

found in the eleventh chapter of Leviticus, even to the breaking of earthen vessels which have become defiled." The law which obliged persons afflicted with loathsome diseases to dwell without the camp is still in force, not merely among tent-dwelling Arabs, but also with the people. We spent the hot summer months of 1852 in a village above Sidon. The inhabitants were nearly all Metawelies, and very fanatical. On a rocky hill to the south, a poor woman (labouring under an infectious disease) was thus separated, living in a booth formed of green bushes. She was not allowed to leave her solitary shelter, and no one was permitted to visit her but the person who carried her daily food. There she passed her wretched days and nights, until death delivered her from the dismal solitude."

The women, according to Dr. Thompson, are "a sallow, forlorn, and ill-conditioned generation, every way inferior to the Christian women who dwell by their side."

"From whom," asks Dr. Thompson, "did they derive this law?

"It is impossible to ascertain. In its details it so closely resembles the Mosaic precepts concerning ceremonial defilements, as to suggest the idea that they have borrowed it from the Jews. . . . . The general mass of the Moslems are the mingled descendants of the various races who composed the population of the Greek empire at the time of Mohammed; and this original confusion of races has been infinitely augmented during the twelve centuries of their lawless occupation. In all the Christian sects there has been the same blending of primitive races, and a large infusion of foreign and European blood during the times of the Crusades, and subsequently, even to our day; so that the most intelligent and learned admit that it is absolutely impossible now to ascertain their true national origin. The Maronites, as a body, may have descended from the ancient Syrians. The Nusarîyeh suggest the idea that they are the miserable *debris* of the accursed Canaanites. The Metâwelies appear to have immigrated from Persia,—they

have a decided resemblance to the Jews. The Moslems of Palestine, and particularly from Carmel southward, have largely intermingled with the Egyptians. Perhaps some of their peculiarities of manners, countenance, and language, may have been derived from the old Philistines, who came originally from Egypt, as I believe, and not from Cappadocia or Cyprus. In the inhabitants of Lebanon and the plains at its base we may possibly find some traces of the ancient Phœnician." *

Volney has given us a better account of the Metoualis than any other writer, though a period of three-quarters of a century has transpired since his work on Egypt and Syria was published.

"To the east of the country of the Druses, in the deep valley which separates their mountains from those of Damascus, we find another small nation, known in Syria by the name of Metoualis. The characteristic distinction between them and the other inhabitants of Syria, is that they, like the Persians, are of the sect of Ali, while all the Turks follow that of Omar or Moaouia. This distinction, occasioned by the schism which, in the thirty-sixth year of the Hegira, arose among the Arabs respecting the successors of Mahomet, is the cause, as I have already observed, of an irreconcilable hatred between the two parties. The sectaries of Omar, who consider themselves as the only orthodox, assume the title of Sonnites, which has that signification, and term their adversaries Shiites, that is Sectaries, of Ali. The word Metouali has the same meaning in the dialect of Syria. The followers of Ali, dissatisfied with this name, substitute that of Adlia, which means Asserters of Justice—literally, Justiciarians—a denomination which they have assumed in consequence of a doctrinal point they advance in opposition to the Sonnite faith. A small Arab treatise, entitled, 'Theological Fragments concerning the Sects and Religions of the World,' has the following passage:—

* "The Land and The Book," by Dr. Thompson, p. 165.

"'Those sectaries who pretend that God acts only on principles of justice conformable to human reason, are called Adlia, or Justiciarians. God cannot, say they, command an impracticable worship, nor ordain impossible actions, nor enjoin men to perform what is beyond their ability; but wherever he requires obedience, will bestow the power to obey. He removes the cause of evil, he allows us to reason, and imposes only what is easy, not what is difficult; he makes no man responsible for the actions of another, nor punishes him for that in which he has no part; he imputes not as a crime what himself has created in man; nor does he require him to avoid what destiny has decreed. This would be injustice and tyranny, of which God is incapable from the perfection of his being.' To this doctrine, which diametrically opposes the system of the Sonnites, the Metoualis add certain ceremonies, which increase their mutual aversion. They curse Omar and Moaouia as rebels and usurpers; and celebrate Ali and Hosain as saints and martyrs. They begin their ablutions at the elbow, instead of the end of the finger, as is customary with the Turks; they think themselves defiled by the touch of strangers, and, contrary to the general practice of the East, neither eat nor drink out of a vessel which has been used by a person not of their sect, nor will they even sit with such at the same table.

"These doctrines and customs, by separating the Metoualis from their neighbours, have rendered them a distinct society. It is said they have long existed as a nation in this country, though their name has never been mentioned by any European writer before the present century; it is not even to be found in the maps of Danville. La Roque, who left their country not a hundred years ago, gives them the names of Amédiens. Be this as it may, in later times, their wars, robberies, success, and various changes of fortune, have rendered them of consequence in Syria. Till about the middle of this century, they only possessed Balbek, their capital, and a few places in the valley, and Anti-Lebanon, which seems to have been their original country. At that period we find them under a like

government with the Druses, under the rule of certain sheiks, with one principal chief of the family of Harfoush."

Subsequently to 1750, they established themselves in the mountainous districts of Bakaa, and got a footing in Lebanon, where they obtained lands belonging to the Maronites, almost as far as Besharrai. They even incommoded the Maronites so much as to oblige the Emir Yousif to attack them with open force, and to expel them; but, on the other side they advanced along the river even to the neighbourhood of Sour (Tyre). In this situation Shaik Daher found them when he managed to effect an alliance with them; they being able to bring into the field ten thousand horsemen, all resolute and formidable troops. Their courage, however, did not prevent their being open to accusations of predatory habits, of robberies committed on Christians and Turks, indiscriminately, of the Pachaliks of Sidon and Damascus, for which chastisement had often been demanded and denounced, but not so easily inflicted. Eventually they took possession of Sour, and made that town their head-quarters.

Sheik Daher, Governor of St. Jean d'Acre from 1750 to to 1776, an Arab by birth, and of Bedouin descent, was the son of a powerful native chief, whose territory extended to the north-west of Tiberius, and included the town of Safad. Daher, in 1749, rebelled against the Turkish authorities of Cæsarea, and took forcible possession of St. Jean d'Acre, in his 63rd year.

From that period Daher played the game of Mohammed Ali, Pacha of Egypt; professed the most devoted fidelity and submission to the Porte, and practised the most flagrant acts of rebellion and opposition to its authority—alternately bribing and cajoling, or secretly conspiring, or openly waging war, against the Sultan's officers and their forces.

"For some years, the Turkish Pachas of Said and Damascus," we are told by Volney, "had been incommoded by the Metoualis, who pillaged their lands and refused their tribute. Daher, sensible of the advantage to be made of these allies,

first interposed as mediator, and afterwards, in order to accommodate the parties, offered to become security for the Metoualis, and pay their tribute. The Pachas accepted this proposal, which rendered their revenues certain, and Daher was content with the bargain he had made, since he had secured the friendship of a people who could bring ten thousand horse into the field. . . . . About the year 1768, he solicited a permanent investiture of his government, for himself and his successor, and demanded to be proclaimed, 'Sheik of Acre, Prince of Princes, Governor of Nazareth, Tabaria, and Safad, and Sheik of all Galilee.' The Porte conceded everything to fear and money; but this proof of vanity awakened more and more her jealousy and displeasure."

So early as 1760, an enemy of Daher, a Mamalouk chief, named Osman, was appointed Pacha of Damascus, as a counterpoise to the dangerous Governor of Acre; and the two sons of Osman were made Pachas of Tripoli and Saide; and, in 1765, the government of Osman was further extended to Jerusalem and the whole of Palestine. The tyranny and rapacity of Osman Pacha throughout Palestine powerfully contributed to sustain Daher against the Porte. The people began to murmur on every side, and Palestine, emboldened by the vicinity of Egypt, now in a state of rebellion, threatened to call in a foreign protector.

Under these circumstances, Ali Bey, the conqueror of Mecca and the Said, turned his projects of aggrandisement towards Syria. The alliance of Daher, the war with the Russians, which entirely occupied the Turks, and the discontents of the people, all conspired to favour his ambition. He accordingly published a manifesto in 1770, in which he declared, that God having bestowed a signal benediction on his arms, he thought himself bound, in duty, to make use of them for the relief of the people, and to repress the tyranny of Osman in Syria.

He immediately dispatched a body of Mamalouks to Gaza, who seized on Ramla and Loud. Daher, two days later, made his appearance with his forces, and took possession of Jaffa

and Ramla, in which towns, as well as Loud, he placed garrisons. At this juncture, Mohammed Bey arrived in Palestine with the grand army, in the month of February, 1771, and followed the Sheik along the sea-coast to Acre. There, having been joined by twelve or thirteen hundred Metoualis, under the command of Nasif, and fifteen hundred Safadians, led by Ali, son of Daher he marched in April towards Damascus.

The Turks in every engagement with Daher and his Egyptian ally, were defeated. Darouish, son of Osmond, Pacha of Saide, had engaged the Druses in his cause, and fifteen hundred Okkals had arrived, under the command of Ali-Djambalat, to reinforce the garrison; while the Emir Yousef, descending into the valley of the Metoualis with twenty-five thousand men, laid everything waste with fire and sword. Ali Daher and Nasif, on this intelligence, directed their course instantly on that side, and, on the 21st of October, 1771, happened the action in which the advanced corps of five hundred Metoualis entirely defeated the whole army of the Druses, whose flight spread terror through Saide, whither they were closely pursued by the Safadians. Ali Djambalat, despairing to defend the town, evacuated it without delay; but not before his Okkals had pillaged it in their retreat. The Metoualis, finding it without defence, entered and plundered it in their turn.

The Porte, terrified at the defeats she had met with, both from the Russians and her rebellious subjects, now offered peace to Daher, on very advantageous conditions. To induce him to consent, she removed the Pachas of Damascus, Saide, and Tripoli; disavowed their conduct, and solicited a reconciliation with the Sheik. Daher, now eighty-five or eighty-six years old, was willing to accept this offer, that he might terminate his days in peace; but he was diverted from this intention by his minister, Ibrahim, who did not doubt but Ali Bey (who was then about to visit Syria, on his return to Egypt), would, the ensuing winter, proceed to the conquest of Syria, and would cede a considerable portion of that country to Daher.

The Porte now renewed the war against Sheik Daher. An army was sent against him. The forces which Daher could muster to oppose them might consist of five or six thousand Safadian and Metouali cavalry, eight hundred of Ali's Mamalouks, and about one thousand Mograbian infantry. Daher had secured the co-operation of some Russian vessels, to second his projected attack on the Turkish army extending along the shore, from the sea to the foot of the adjacent mountains. At the foot of the mountains the Druse allies of the Turks, armed with muskets, were drawn up.

On the side of Sheik Daher, the Metoualis and Safadians were extended on the plain, so as to present the greatest front possible to the Turks. The right wing consisted of Metoualis and the Mograb infantry, intended to oppose the Druses.

The Turks were completely routed; the Pachas of Damascus, Tripoli, and Said, and their troops, fled pell-mell.

The Druses, who never engage with good will on the side of the Turks, presently left the field, and hid themselves in their mountains, and in less than an hour the plain was cleared. The allies, satisfied with their victory, would not risk a pursuit, in a country which would become more difficult the nearer they approached Bairout; but the Russian ships, to punish the Druses, proceeded to cannonade that town, where they made a descent, and burnt three hundred houses.

Ali Bey and Daher, on their return to Acre, determined to take vengeance for acts of treachery of the people of Nablous and Jaffa, and in the beginning of July, 1772, appeared before the latter city, besieged it and took possession of it in February, 1773.

Ali Bey shortly after took his departure for Egypt.

At this time, a Syrian, named Ahmed Djezzar, a creature of the Turks, had been placed at the head of affairs in Beirout, by the Pacha of Damascus. No sooner had Djezzar been placed in power by the Turkish governor, than he determined to wield it for himself, professing, however, as is usual in such cases, to be the faithful slave and servant of the Sultan, and

only acting for his benefit against his unworthy employé in Damascus. Daher got up an expedition, both by sea and land, against Beirout.

Beirout was then a town largely inhabited, and frequented by the Druses. This wily people no sooner gained intelligence of Daher's projects, than they assembled and determined on contracting an alliance with Daher. This treaty was concluded near Sour, the site of ancient Tyre. Beirout was besieged by Daher, and obliged to capitulate; and Djezzar, the future ruler of St. Jean d'Acre, was carried to that town a prisoner, but in a short time contrived to effect his escape.

The defection of the Druses, on this occasion, from the Turks, had nothing in it of a novel character. A little later in 1775, they declined to come to the aid of Daher, when he was in need of their assistance, in fact in the last extremity. On that occasion, also, the Metoualis failed him.

In 1771, the Metoualis had been of great service to Ali Bey and Daher, against the Turks. But Emir Yousef having in their absence armed the Druses, ravaged their country. He was besieging the castle of Djezin, when the Metoualis, returning from Damascus, received intelligence of this invasion. At the relation of the barbarities committed by the Druses, an advanced corps, of only five hundred men, were so enraged, that they immediately rushed forward against the enemy, determined to perish in taking vengeance. But the surprise and confusion they occasioned, and the discord which reigned between the two factions of Mansour and Yousef, so much favoured this desperate attack, that the whole army, consisting of twenty-five thousand men, was completely overthrown.

In the following year, the affairs of Daher taking a favorable turn, the zeal of the Metoualis cooled towards him, and they finally abandoned him in the catastrophe in which he lost his life. But they have suffered for their imprudence, under the administration of the Pacha who succeeded him. Since the year 1777, Djezzar, master of Acre and Saide, has incessantly laboured to destroy them. His persecution forced them, in

1784, to a reconciliation with the Druzes, and to enter into an alliance with the Emir Yousef. Though reduced to less than seven hundred armed men, they did more in that campaign than fifteen or twenty thousand Druses and Maronites, assembled at Dair-el-Kamar. They alone took the strong fortress of Mar-Djebaa, and put to the sword fifty or sixty Arnaouts, who defended it. But the misunderstanding which prevailed among the chiefs of the Druses, having rendered abortive all their operations, the Pacha has obtained possession of the whole valley, and the city of Balbek itself. At this period, not more than five hundred families of the Metoualis remained, who took refuge in Anti-Lebanon, and the Lebanon of the Maronites; and, driven as they now are from their native soil, it is probable they will be totally annihilated, and even their very name extinct.

At the close of 1775, Sheik Daher perished on the field of battle, upwards, it is said, of ninety years of age; not killed by the Turkish enemy he was fighting, but perfidiously slain by one of his own mercenaries, a Mograb or Barbary soldier.

When the usual Turkish ceremony was performed in this case of cutting off the head of a slain rebel governor, pickling it and sending it off to be presented to the Sultan, Djezzar was temporarily appointed the successor of Daher by the Capitan Pacha, by whose measures Daher's final ruin had been effected; and a little later, the Sultan appointed Djezzar, pacha of Acre and Sidon.*

With this episode in Turkish history, the author of this work is only concerned as far as it relates to the part taken by the Metoualis and the Druses, in the contentions and warfare of their rulers.

* Travels through Syria and Egypt in 1783, 1783, and 1735, by C. F. Volney. Vol. 2.

CHAPTER XI.

The Influence of Russia over the Great Mass of the Christian Population of the Turkish Empire.—The Exercise and Results of that Influence at Different Periods of the Greek Revolution.

THE political influence of Russia in Turkey is the result of its religious influence there.

The identity of the religion of Russia with that of the great majority of the Christian communities scattered over the provinces of the Turkish Empires, and concentrated in Constantinople, constitutes the first great element in the union of interests, influences, and sympathies of the Russian and Greek populations. This union is based, moreover, on something stronger than an exercise of the reasoning powers on the part of the Greeks. It has its foundation in the permanent religious instinct of the people, which travellers, who hate all religions but their own, call prevalent religious fanaticism. The same permanent religious principle, idea, or instinct, certainly prevails in Russia, and we need not wonder at its power or permanency. The Greek religion is not only the law-established religion of the State, but no other religion enters into competition with it. Why is that religious principle, idea, or instinct so permanently fixed in the hearts and heads of the Greeks of the Orthodox Church throughout the Levant?

Because, in the first place, their Church has undergone persecution and spoliation.

The Greek clergy have acquired the power and influence they have so long and successfully exercised over their flock, and

continue to exercise in Turkey—simply because they have been always true to the cause of nationality of their countrymen, no less than to the interests of the Greek Church, as they understood them, in all simplicity and sincerity of religious belief.

Herein is the chief danger which menaces the Turkish Empire, the field that is thus opened, in all its provinces, for Russian influence, and the operations of secret emissaries of Russia.

All strength of religious belief, in any Church that is not Protestant, passes for a fierce fanaticism, therefore, all the efforts of that Russian influence in Turkey, is ascribed to that spirit, or the pretension to it of a fraudulent policy, seeking only territorial aggrandisement, and regardless of any results of a religious nature.

My belief is, there is not a people in Christendom more sincerely and strongly attached to their religion than the Russians.

In the event of Russian interference in the affairs of Turkey, effectually taking place, the Sclavonic populations, in all probability, would be among the first of the Christian races to espouse the cause of Russia, if their animosities with the Greeks, even those of their own Orthodox Church, did not tend to embarrass, I will not say hinder, any combined action between them.

Whenever the opportunity comes, and Turkey's weakness presents it to them, I believe the instincts of race will prevail over any religious antipathies that now exist, and the common tie of Sclavonic origin, which binds the Wallachian and Moldavian with the great Sclavonic hive of Russia, will be found more powerful in its antagonism to Turkey, than any array of hostile feelings on the parts of Christian communities, slightly differing in religious rites, against each other.

Strange to say, the power of England, exercised at the Ottoman Porte, has led, even of late years, to the deprivation of the Greek Patriarch by the Sultan, and ordering the synod to proceed to the election of another.

In 1840, the English Government, through its ambassador, complained of the Greek Patriarch exercising his spiritual functions in a way injurious to the interests of British rule in the Ionian Islands, transgressing the limits of ecclesiastical authority, and incriminating the power exercised by British functionaries in the Protectorate.

The poor Greek Patriarch of Constantinople in the legitimate exercise of his spiritual rights, for expressing in his pastoral communications to his clergy, his sorrow and indignation at the cruel treatment of Greek ecclesiastics in the Ionian Islands at the hands of Sir Henry Ward, at the summary executions of them, and all the attending circumstances of a revolting character, which have been reprobated elsewhere, in the British Press and Parliament, was sacrificed by the Sultan at the request of the British ambassador, instigated by the Lord High Commissioner of the Ionian Islands, to punish the head of that religion, whose priests he had *suspended*, with a vengeance—by the neck—for calling in question those acts of his, which brought so much disgrace on the British name in her colonial government. The late Sir Henry Ward, whose exploits in public life we have recently seen so glorified in the British Press, has probably done more to make British power odious, not only in the Ionian islands, but throughout Greece, than any individual of his nation has ever done before.

But what will the eulogists of Turkish rule over Christian Rajahs say to this sacrifice of a Greek Patriarch by the Sultan, at the bidding of a European power of a different religion? We are constantly dosed *usque ad nauseum*, with hyperbolical commendations of Turkish toleration, protection of Christian Churches, perfect independence of Patriarchs, and security for prelates, priests, and monks. Let those who administer those nauseous doses of admiration for Turkish tolerance, turn to the Imperial edict, depriving the Greek Patriarch of his office, published in the *Moniteur Ottomane*, the 14th March, 1848.

The earliest known exercise of secret Russian influence in the territory of Turkey, of a hostile nature to the Ottoman Empire,

was in the reign of the Empress Anne, 1730—41, when Russian emissaries were sent into Epirus, and the mountains of Thessally, to stir up the Greek Rajahs to insurrection, scattering gold and inflammatory proclamations with unsparing hands.

The Greeks made a partial insurrection, and were perfidiously abandoned to their fate by their Russian sympathisers, at the peace of 1739, as they always subsequently have been, as often as they rebelled and have been unsuccessful.

In the reign of the Empress Elizabeth, new Russians were sent into Greece (1741—62), and stealthily sowed the seeds of disaffection to the Turkish Government, scattered vague rumours of war against the Ottoman Porte, whispered mysterious communications, semi-religious allusions to scriptural predictions of help from on high, and hopes of approaching emancipation for the people of the holy Orthodox, especially among the Mainotes.

The Greeks, in all their insurrections, have been powerfully acted on by those vague, mysterious allusions to their religion, and to their deliverance from thraldom, on account of it, at the hands of the Russians.

In 1770, new Russian intrigues in Greece, led to another abortive insurrection, and all the inevitably calamitous consequences of abortive insurrections to the defeated insurgents.

The foreign power by which they were instigated to rebel, as usual, ultimately abandoned them to their fate.

Fifty thousand Greeks were massacred, while the Russians looked quietly from their vessels on the conflagration of the town and villages of their slaughtered dupes. So much for hopes of deliverance from servitude at the hands of foreign powers, pretending to sympathise with an oppressed people, purposing only to promote its own selfish policy. It was during this insurrection the Turkish fleet was destroyed at Tchesmè in July, 1770.

The treaty between Russia and the Porte of Kainardji, in 1779, conferred considerable advantages on the Greeks, and

caused the latter more than ever to regard the Russians as their natural protectors. By one of the articles of the treaty above mentioned, the Porte engaged to protect the Christian religion and its churches in its Empire, and to permit the accredited ministers of Russia at Constantinople to represent to the Porte any grievances the Christian Rayahs might have to complain of, and to remonstrate with the Turkish Governors against any injury or injustice done them.

A new treaty of peace between those Powers, that of Jassy, in January, 1792, which recognised the annexation of the Crimea to Russia, was productive of further advantages to the Greeks.

The Czar, Peter, made no secret of his views of the duties imposed on him and his successors, as he piously believed, by divine Providence to dismember the Turkish Empire, and make Constantinople the metropolis of Russia, the great emporium of the commerce of the east.

In the year 1720, Peter the Great concluded a treaty with the Porte, in which, for the first time, Russia, after the example of the Catholic Powers, stipulates for the protection of Russian monks and pilgrims to Jerusalem.

The 11th article of this treaty, which was confirmed by the same article of the treaty of Belgrade, in 1739, is the origin of the protectorate, which the czars, at a later period, claimed over the Greeks in Turkey. It runs thus:—

"The merchants of both nations shall enjoy perfect security in travelling and trafficking between the two countries. The Russians shall make pilgrimages to Jerusalem, and other holy places, and they shall not be subject, either at Jerusalem or elsewhere, to any tribute, karadj, pekasch, nor to any pecuniary exaction whatever for their passports. Russian ecclesiastics remaining in the territories of the Porte, shall not be molested."

Fortune, in arresting the progress of Peter the Great at the foot of the Pruth, suspended the execution of his projects; but the design of stirring up revolt in Greece, at a fitting

moment never was abandoned. It passed as a tradition to his successors. The master design of Peter the Great was transmitted to them in a code of testamentary instructions of a remarkable character. The authenticity of this document has been called in question, but the genuine state Russian character of the secret haute politique, of the instructions, admits of no doubt or denial. It may certainly be said of it, "s'il n'est vrai, c'est bien trouvè."

Russian designs against Turkey are of a very different form from those against Hindostan.

Captain Rollo Burslem, in a work entitled, "A Peep into Turkistan" (Lon. 8vo. 1846), gives an interesting account of those regions which a Russian army would have to traverse that was destined to invade Hindostan, and with that view was to reach Affghanistan.

Captain Burslem explored a part of Turkistan which he believes was never before visited by a European. A great tract of country between Ghoree and Badighar, of about eighty miles extent. One of those passes of perilous and difficult defiles between the Russian territory and Affghanistan, which, notwithstanding their utter impracticability for routes to be traversed by an army of Europeans, at the period of our Affghanistan war, served to frighten these islands from their propriety as fraught with danger from Russia to the Indian Empire of Great Britain.

Of the immense difficulty that a modern army of considerable numbers, with all its incumbrances, would have to encounter in such a country; of the hopelessness of preserving any efficiency or even a tithe of the numerical strength of an army marched through such regions as those visited by Captain Burslem, that intelligent officer leaves his readers in no doubt.

The extensive regions of Turkistan, through which he travelled, are subject to great and sudden changes of temperature, prejudicial to health. The soil of the extensive plains is for the most part poor and barren, patches of verdure, with luxuriant grass, are the exceptions; and dreary wastes of vast

extent, without water, or traces of cultivation, or sign of former habitation, a vestige of the wreck of past civilisation, are the rule.

"When we consider (says Captain Burslem) the passes of Turkistan embrace only a small part of the distance to be traversed by an army from the west, we may well dismiss from our minds that ridiculous impression, once so prevalent in India, that is now justly denominated *Aupophobia*. What a fearful amount of human suffering might have been averted! What national disgrace might have been avoided! What millions of treasure might have been saved, had the authorities of India but examined the practicability of an invasion, which Russia had too much wisdom ever seriously to contemplate.*"

Be it borne in mind these reflections of an intelligent military man, were made shortly after the disastrous Affghanistan war with Great Britain.

There is a remarkable notice in Eton's "Survey of the Turkish Empire," third edition, 1801, of a project of a French officer, Monsieur de St. Yenie, pressed on the Empress Catherine of Russia, about 1780, of a Russian expedition to be sent against the English in Hindostan, through Bochkara to Cashemire, and thence to Bengal. The projector had formed a similar plan for destroying the British dockyards and vessels of war in them, and executed a similar ingenious device for the destruction of the Dutch arsenal. The Empress, we are told by Mr. Eton, received the project favorably, and foresaw little difficulty in transporting an army through Bochkara, or danger of encountering any formidable Mohammedan resistance, inasmuch as a part of the project was to re-establish the Mogul Emperor in India, and place a Mogul-Mohammedan Prince on the throne at Delhi. The projector stated that there were passes through the mountains that rendered the march of an invading Russian army into India, an easy matter, and that he had seen people who had been sent there to examine these passes by M. de Vergennes, the French minister.

* Captain Burslem's Peep into Turkistan, p. 177.

The map, accompanying the projected route, was duly examined and highly approved by the Empress. But Prince Potemken, despite his enmity to the English as well as the Turks, ridiculed the project, and no doubt that able and astute Russian minister, had good reasons for so doing, notwithstanding the reminiscences of many successful invasions of Hindostan, of Timour's expedition in 1398, of Nadir Scha's in 1738, and of Abdallah, several times from 1748 to 1765.

In the reign of Catherine, the designs of Russia against Turkey took the form of a policy, whose key-note was the necessity of Constantinople being made a part of the Russian Empire. In the correspondence of the Prince de Ligne, we find a letter dated from a town in the Crimea, the 1st of June, 1787, wherein the Prince, speaking of the conversations he had held with the Empress Catherine and the Emperor Joseph of Austria, on the subject of the Turkish Empire, says :—

"Their Majesties, now and then, touched on the subject of those poor devils of Turks, and some hints were thrown out in a quiet sort of way. As an amateur of *virtu*, I spoke of re-establishing the Greeks and talked of Alcibiades : Catherine was for resuscitating Lycurgus and Solon ; but Joseph, who thought more of the future than the past, more of the positive and the practical than the ideal, exclaimed, 'What the devil will you do with Constantinople?'" And Ubicini states it was during this visit to the Crimea that the project of seizing on the Ottoman Empire was agreed on between Catherine the 2nd and the Emperor Joseph, though the final details of its dismemberment were reserved for a future period.

Peter's successor, Catherine the 1st, carried out the views, and acted on the testamentary instructions of her father, in regard to Turkey. She began the process of dismemberment, by making the Crimea a Russian province.

The conversation of the august sovereigns in the Crimea, was soon followed, in 1787, by the war of Russia with the "poor devils of Turks," who continued, however, to baffle the

chief designs of the august sovereigns. The Turkish territory of the Crimea, however, became a Russian province.

The European powers, in 1787 and 1788, as in 1828, looked on as passive spectators of the struggle between Russia and Turkey. Russia, from the first, could always speculate largely on the baseness of Austria and Prussia, and the readiness of either power to connive at or to promote any policy of hers, that had for its aim, territorial robbery or aggrandizement. At all times the baseness, treachery, and perfidiousness of Austria, especially in its character of a great European power, always truckling to powerful despotism and great enmity to national right, has been uniform. So long as Turkey was powerful, and brutally oppressive towards its christian Rayahs, all her sympathies were with Turkey, and her best secret services given to her perfidiously, to turn any resistance of those oppressed christian races on her borders, into abortive insurrection.

One need not be much surprised at the sure support in all emergencies, that Russia, in any scheme of plunder or state burglary, might expect from a new state like Prussia, composed of plundered territories, the result of German raids and ravages in countries bordering on Russia and Austria, of wholesale robberies of small states and colonies on the part of Teutonic Knights, of the merging of one of those potent and ruthless brigands, the Grand Master of the order, into a duke of East Prussia, an acknowledged fief of Poland; and in 1594, of the union of that dukedom of Prussia, with the Electorate of Brandenburgh as it exists at the present time, that Prussia, whose independance as a state under Frederick William, surnamed The Great, was only acknowledged by Poland so late as 1657. The Emperor Alexander, the great Napoleon's friend, "a Greek of the Lower Empire," full of fraud and dissimulation, spoke of the possession of Constantinople as a necessity for Russia. To use his words, "Russia must have the key of her own house."

Alexander's successor, the Emperor Nicholas—a fanatic, and a man of very inferior intellectual powers, a despicable prince who set no value on truth, nor attached any importance to fidelity in the observance of a promise, or of binding obligations in an oath, like the Empress Catherine—had a pet project of annexation of Turkey to the Russian dominions, and he tried hard that "Russia should have the key of her own house," and he discovered the poor devils of Turks were sick men, and it only remained for Europe to bury the Mosque with honour, and to remove the remains of the late sick man to a quiet grave on the Asiatic side of the Bosphorus.

In the history of people robbed of their independence, and whose condition has become one of long continued servitude, humiliation, and abject existence, nothing can be more monotonous than its records of suffering and subjection. There are no great changes of fortune, no stirring events of great pith and moment, no sudden outbursts of enthusiasm, flights of genius, or glare of grandeur, or transient brilliancy of any signal exploit, or noble effort to shake off oppression in the pages of that sad history. Or if now and then its monotony is relieved for a moment, by a clamorous resistance to the occasional caprices of despotism, the miseries of the sequel of an abortive insurrection tend only to render the narrative still more painful. "Years, and even ages of servitude," says M. Villemain, "roll on in tedious uniformity. Generation succeeds generation without leaving a trace behind; there are no events to vivify the scene. There is nothing new, even in the sufferings of the oppressed; and their misfortunes are as monotonous as the pity they inspire."

The time, however, came when this long monotony in the history of Greek servitude was broken.

From the time of the treaty of Kainardji, in 1779, the Greeks became eminently commercial and maritime; and with surprising rapidity, equipped multitudes of trading vessels in the ports of Thrace, Macedonia, and Greece, and the principal islands of the Archipelago. The prosperity that ensued, the

impetus given to intellectual pursuits, the establishment, above all, of schools, in which Greek nationality was not sedulously suppressed or banned, as in their former places of primitive instruction, were the precursors of Greek independence and an Hellenic kingdom in our days.

Rhigas, of Thessally, was the first of his countrymen to stir in this cause, and was the first martyr of it. His grand idea was the regeneration of his countrymen, by creating in Greece a passion for its literature, and a love for his beautiful country. *A man* of the name of Thomas Daves, half a century later than Rhigas, determined to regenerate his countrymen, resolved, in Ireland, to attempt the same object, through the same intellectual agencies.

"In 1796, Rhigas repaired to Vienna, to mature his enterprise, and to prepare for its execution. From thence he corresponded with the members of the Hetairia, who were dispersed through different parts of Greece, and with the authorities of the French directory. He there edited a Greek journal for the instruction of his fellow countrymen, and printed his translation of '*Le Voyage de Jeune Anacharsis.*' He also constructed a map of Greece, and had it engraved on a large scale, with the names of places in Romaic, which he probably intended to serve as a basis of operation for the Hetairists. At the same time, his odes and songs, written likewise in Romaic, the language of the people, and inspired by the fervour of patriotism, aroused in the hearts of all, an enthusiasm for liberty and for their country. His famous song, which has been said to be an imitation of the Marseillaise, 'Sons of the Greeks, arise!' and his other equally famous hymn of the mountaineers, 'Heroes, how long shall we dwell in the mountains?' were sung and echoed throughout Greece."

In 1821, while the Greek revolution was spreading terror over the Turkish Empire, another insurrection having broken out in Wallachia and Moldavia, the old panacea, and "sovereign remedy for an inward bruise" of the Turkish state—a series of massacres of the Christians of the Turkish capital, and through-

out several of the provinces—was had recourse to. An able writer and zealous champion of the Turkish Empire, M. Ubicini, informs us that the government, having proclaimed "the holy war" in Constantinople by the Hatti Scheriffe of March the 31st, 1821, the lives of the entire Christian community were placed in the most imminent peril.

In the middle of the 17th century, some twenty families of Greeks, old or opulent, who claimed to be the descendants of the nobles of their race before the Mohammedan conquest, and some of them even heirs of the last imperial Princes of Constantinople and Trebizond, existed in a quarter of Constantinople called the Fanar or Fanal. Their acquaintance with foreign languages—for which acquirement their race appears to have a peculiar aptitude, the genius of it, moreover, improved by education, which rendered craft and intellectual activity peculiarly adapted for employment in a community where all mental energies were dormant—made these Fanariotes first useful, and in a short time indispensable to their Ottoman lords as interpreters, secretaries, employés, and various influential and confidential officers of the Porte.

For nearly seventy years, they maintained their position and ascendency over all other raiahs, servile and sordid, they were wholly devoted to the acquisition of wealth, and the promotion of Turkish interests. But a change appears to have come over their views, and the tendencies of their prosperity, from the time that the secret society of the Hetairia, and the labours of the martyr Rhigas had taken firm root in the minds of the Greeks of the Morea, Moldavia, and Wallachia.

The Fanariotes became patrons of learning, and founders of Greek schools and colleges in Constantinople, Smyrna, Salonica, and some of the islands of the Archipelago, and continued so to be to the time of their downfall in 1820.

In 1814, a new Hellenic society, with the name of Philomusii, was formed in Vienna, at the head of which was Count Capo d'Istrias, a Carfiote, in the services of Russia. Strange to say, the society was formed during the sitting of the Con-

gress at Vienna, and some of the sovereigns present, and the representatives of others became the patrons of it. We need not, however, wonder that the Emperor Alexander was one of them, for the professed object of the Philo-musii, to extend education and promote literary objects in Greece, was in reality to give an impulse to Greek nationalism, and secretly to revive the cause for which Rhigas died. From 1814 to 1820, the leaders of the Philo-musii, professing moral force doctrines, and those of the Hetairia confederacy, disciples of the physical force school, with an organisation nearly similar to the Carbonari of Italy, carried on their machinations against the Turkish government, conjointly; and in 1820, their numbers were estimated at upwards of two hundred thousand. Their revolutionary phase dates from 1818, when an insurrection was attempted in Servia, which, though unsuccessful, was not unproductive of advantages to the Greek cause. In the beginning of 1821, Alexander Ypsilantis unfurled the flag of the Hetairists in the Danubian provinces, and made another abortive insurrection, which Russia, true to her old system of abandoning those whom she had compromised, the moment their cause was lost, denounced in a solemn ukase of the Emperor, and played the same perfidious part she had done in the Morea in 1770, and still more recently in Servia in 1818, when she first encouraged and then disavowed the attempt of Czerny-Georgy.

When the news of the insurrection attempted by Ypsilantis, and a similar outbreak in the Morea, reached Constantinople, in the beginning of 1821, conflagrations in the capital, and massacres of Christians of all sects, but especially of Greeks, on a grand scale followed.

The absence of a newspaper press in the Turkish dominions heretofore, in all panics, has been usually supplied by other means of giving vent to great public fears; popular cries of any kind, for justice or for vengeance; cries of religion in danger, or of the State on the verge of ruin. A conflagration is had recourse to. Pious political Dervishes, in such emergencies,

go about the city, in the dusk of the evening, wildly and fiercely stirring up the dormant fears and fanaticism of the multitude, and causing a publication of popular opinion to be made, by setting fire to a particular quarter of the city; or, if they want to do something equivalent to an appearance of leading articles on the same subject, in the columns of the *Times* newspaper, for several successive days, they have houses in different quarters of the city, set fire to, night after night, for a few days, till an impression is made on the mind of the Turkish Government by this public mode of manifesting popular feelings of alarm or discontent. Thus Turkish agitators have been so long spared the expense and trouble of printing their wrongs, terrors, or opinions on public matters.

The conduct of Austria in every phase of the Greek revolution, was alike cruel, treacherous, and ungenerous to the struggles of this Christian people. Those who wish to see Austrian power renewed in Italy, must be quite unacquainted with the history of the turpitude of her diplomacy in the east, and of her rule of galling, stupidly insulting tyranny in Italy.

The Greeks, certainly will never forget nor forgive the foul murder of their Rhigas, to which Austria was not only privy, but a prime participator in its guilt. When Rhigas had completely organised his first effort for the liberation of Greece, and the Greeks only awaited the signal from him, to rise in insurrection in every part of the Pelponnessus, and was about to embark at Trieste for the Morea, with eight of his companions, he was arrested by the Austrian authorities, by the order of their government; and, by the Austrian police, this truly noble and greatly gifted man (then in his 33rd year) was delivered up into the hands of the Turks, perfectly conscious, as the Austrian Government and Austrian authorities must have been, that they were delivering him over to certain death. And as a matter of course, Rhigas was put to death by the Turks, at Belgrade, the 8th of May, 1798.

The corpse of the patriot who was slain, fairly, perhaps, by the Turks, foully murdered by the Austrians, was flung into the

Danube. All the waters of that deep river cannot cover the guilt of that foul act of Austria—its participation in the death of Rhigas.

Some years later, another Greek insurrection broke out in the Moldo-Wallachian territory, at the head of which was Alexander Ypsilantis, and after a signal defeat at Dragachan, had to seek refuge in the Austrian territory. The unfortunate insurgent chief was immediately arrested, and sent to the Hungarian fortress of Mongatz, and there kept in captivity for some years. Austria probably thought the blood of Rhigas was enough on its hands, and on its conscience, if I may be allowed to use that expression in connection with anything of State in Austria.

No sooner had the Turkish Government manifested its power in Constantinople in massacres of its Christian subjects, in 1820 and 1821, than the entire Greek population of the Morea manifested its revenge in a series of revolts, commencing at Calamata, a southern town of the Morea. The chief promoter of, if not leader in this revolt, was Alexander Mavrocordato.

On the First of January, 1822, *the Senate, or National Congress of representatives, was established at Calamata*, transferred its sittings to Tripolitza, thence to Argos, and from Argos to Epidaurus, and from that spot issued forth its memorable declaration of independence. The executive government was vested in a commission of five members, and the office of president was conferred on Prince Alexander Mavrocordato. The declaration of independence is well worthy of being recorded and remembered by all states struggling for their liberties.

The declaration was as follows :—

"*In the name of the Holy and Indivisible Trinity, the Greek nation, wearied by the dreadful weight of Ottoman oppression, and resolved to break its yoke, though at the price of the greatest sacrifices, proclaims to-day, before God and men, by the organ of its lawful representatives, met in a national assembly, its Independence.*"*

* Ubicini, "Lettres sur la Turquie," vol. 2.

I am disposed to think that the Greek declaration of independence is a nobler document than that of the Americans, and that the recently emancipated states of Italy have not put forward any declaration at all comparable to it.

The wholesale indiscriminate massacres of Christians in Constantinople, the murder of the Greek Patriarch, and the Bishops of Ephesus, Nicomedia, and Achiale, by the Turks, with the sanction, and under the eyes of the authorities, in the latter end of 1820, and beginning of 1821, gave a greater stimulus to the cause of the Greek revolutionists than it ever before received. Thousands of Greeks, who never before dreamt of joining their countrymen in arms in the Morea, now flocked to their standard of independence. In England, France, and America, the Greek cause was taken up with extraordinary enthusiasm. Byron gave heart and soul, his glorious genius, his means, his life to it.*

It has been the fashion of late years, to ridicule the enthusiastic, generous support given in England to the Greek cause of independence. Unfortunately the tendency of our times is to ridicule everything that is *unselfishly unsectarian and unprecedented*, and at the same time generous and enthusiastic in our sympathies with the aims, efforts, and aspirations of people struggling to regain lost rights, or to establish a new national regime of independence.

And yet England has more just reason to be proud of her efforts, pecuniary, parliamentary, and literary, to aid the Greeks in their struggle for independence, than of any exercise of dip-

* In the beginning of 1824, the author of this work, then in Naples, was advised very strongly by the late Earl of Blessington, to proceed to Messalonghe in the capacity of medical attendant of Lord Byron. When Lord Byron was departing from Genoa on his expedition, Lord Blessington urged on him earnestly to take with him a medical attendant in whom he placed much confidence. Lord Byron declined to do so, but subsequently he expressed his regret that he had not acceded to Lord Blessington's wishes. It was in these circumstances that the latter urged me to proceed to Messalonghe, furnished with a letter to Lord Byron which could not fail to result in the appointment designed for me. I did not require many arguments to induce me to act on this proposal. I sailed from Naples for Smyrna, and on my arrival at the latter place, the first news that reached me was the death of Lord Byron.

lomatic astuteness which has taken place in recent times, in behalf of oppressed nationalities. The services rendered to the Greeks were without any reference to their religion, commerce, geographical position, or the bearing of the latter on mercantile or naval interests in the Mediterranean. Greece, be it remembered, from first to last, struggled not only for her independence, but for her religion. She never compromised the latter from any views of expediency, or of deference to any prejudices or opinions well or ill founded, against that opinion on the part of those Christian Powers she looked to for succour, and received assistance from.

The Greeks began their revolution with the ministers of religion on their side; they ended it successfully with the same natural protectors of their country's civil and religious rights, behind the scenes of all those aspirations which terminated in an independent kingdom and emancipated Church.

England, I say, has reason to be proud of the generous and unselfish part she acted in this great struggle of the Greeks for their independence, and grand achievement of its attainment.

By the Protocols of London, of the 5th of February, and the 7th of March, 1830, Greece was erected into an independent kingdom, comprising the Peloponessus, Allica, Euboæ, and all the territory south of the Gulf of Volo, to the eastern point of the Gulf of Arta. And by the subsequent Protocol of July following, the Ottoman Porte completed the establishment of the limits of the new Hellenic kingdom; by which it ceded more than seven hundred square geographical miles of territory, and nearly a million subjects, in consideration of an indemnity of twelve millions of francs—say, in round numbers, half a million sterling.

The Turkish provinces of Moldavia and Wallachia, by the treaty of Paris, of 1856, were declared a constitutional government, under one elective prince, two ministers, two elective assemblies, and a central commission. From the "Almanach de Gotha," for 1860, the following details are taken:—

"Wallachia contains a population of about two millions of inhabitants, and a hundred thousand strangers, subjects of other States.

Moldavia contains a population of 1,400,000.

The Greek religion (separated from the Roman Catholic Church) is professed by the inhabitants of both principalities.

The Roman Catholics amount to about 50,000; Protestants, 10,000.

Servia, under its own Prince, elected in 1858, and governmental administration, contained a population, in 1854, of 958,000 inhabitants.

Montenegro, under its own Prince, and administration of government, has a population of 125,000 inhabitants, chiefly of the Greek religion separated from the Church of Rome.

CHAPTER XII.

The Syrian Massacres of 1860.

THE recent atrocities committed by the Druses on the Maronites, connived at by the Turkish authorities in Damascus, Deir-el-Kammar, Hasbeya, Rasheya, and numerous minor towns and villages of Mount Lebanon, are spoken of and looked upon in Europe as casual occurrences, as isolated unexampled outbursts of fanaticism, and religious strife, on the part of ignorant, intolerant, and besotted people in a Turkish province, one portion of whose inhabitants belong to a Christian sect in communion with the Roman Catholic church, and another to a Pagan community, who, when it suits their purpose, profess to be Mohammedans, and on other occasions, pretend to English missionaries to be favourably disposed towards Protestant Christianity.

These massacres are to be considered in connection with the general character of Turkish rule, its uniform savagery, intolerance, and fanaticism, in relation to the Christian subjects of the Porte; and the persistent nature of the hostility of English and French interests in the Levant, and especially in Syria, to the influence severally exercised in that country by the Consular authority of each power.

The French sovereigns from the time of St. Louis, claim, in virtue of treaties, the right of protecting the Roman Catholics of the Turkish Empire in general, the Maronites of Syria in particular.

The English government since 1825, exercises the privilege of protecting Protestant missions in Syria, for the conversion of Jews and Christians who are Roman Catholics, and through its Consuls, carries on for its missionaries a perpetual war with the Maronite community especially, and through them espouses on all occasions of sectarian strife and bloodshed, the side of their enemies, the Druses, so far as defending their acts and inculpating their opponents.

Such is the state of things in Syria, which is taken advantage of, ever and anon, in Constantinople when a panic has occurred. Because a war with Russia is apprehended, or there is a dearth of corn, or a dread of insurrection in some Danubian province, or a want of money in the treasury to pay the troops and employés. No people are so subject to panics as the Turks of large towns and cities, and nothing can be more invariable than the form in which all Turkish panics are manifested—namely, in headlong impulses of furibund fanaticism, prompting the panic-stricken to shed the blood of Christians, to take vengeance on the Giaours for the fears and suspicions they are the occasion of; to suspect all the Rayahs of the provinces, as well as those of Stamboul, as leagued in a conspiracy to murder all true believers, and therefore to be beforehand with them, to let the Dervishes loose on them in the capital or some particular province, and have a religious war and a massacre, piously, and at first, covertly counselled and enjoined.

It is not in the official correspondence of Consuls, with their several governments, or in those papers relative to the Syrian massacres laid before the parliament, that we are likely to discover any trace of the true origin of them. Those papers may be read from beginning to end without finding any clue to the unaccountable conduct of people of a different race altogether from the Druses, who manifestly connived at their atrocities; nay, participated therein, and were the projectors of that conspiracy against the Christians of all sects and races in Syria.

The originators of that conspiracy were not Druses nor Metoualis nor Ansayriens; *they were Ottoman Turks; the*

conspiracy was hatched in Constantinople. The bond that united its members, the life and soul, the breath and the heart's blood of it was fanaticism; the object of it was to create a revolution out of hatred of the reforms that had been fatal to the Janissaries in 1826, had introduced the Hatti-sheriff of Gulhanch and Tanzimat of 1839, which conferred privileges on the Christian Rayahs, and violated the principles of the Koran, and had given power and influence at the Porte to the representatives of European nations, who were in the sight of all true moslems, mere dogs, children of the shitan, Nazarenes, infidels, all that is impious and infamous—in one word—Giaours.

The vile policy of Turkey, the guilt of which, however, is not confined altogether to a Mohammedan government, has ever been to keep the different races and sects of its empire at daggers drawn; to keep them wrangling and jangling among themselves about matters of opinion, differences of religion, race and rights, established by prescription, or claimed in virtue of an ancient capitulater, and a prior or a better title than that of others to protection or pre-eminence. By this policy of weakening a people, composed of different races and religious communities, the Turkish Empire has ever sought its strength; but the advantages derived from it are necessarily only temporary. The time must come when they will not only cease to exist, but when the results of this policy, persisted in for ages, must prove detrimental to the state—nay, destructive to its true interests.

In the spring of 1860, advantage was taken for the promotion of the interests and objects of Turkish fanaticism, of the jealousies and animosities always in existence in Syria, between the different creeds and races, because always fomented by the Turkish authorities; and from the year 1825, unhappily greatly aggravated since the Consuls of foreign nations became more prominently protectors and partizans of missionaries of the churches, propagation associations and Bible societies of their several countries.

Since the last-mentioned period, the interests of the Maronites

have been taken up by the Consuls and missionaries of France, those of "the Orthodox Greeks," by the Consuls and clergy of their co-religionists of Russia; those of the Druses, by the Consuls and agents and ministers of the Bible societies of England. The legitimate duties of the Consuls of those three great powers, those duties connected with the interests of the commerce, the political influence, the civilization of these several countries, are, to a very great extent, subordinated to the interests of proselytising institutions, and the views respecting them, of ministers of religion, exceedingly inimical to other ecclesiastics and communities of Christians out of the pale of their own church establishment.

In 1825, when the new Anglican element of discord was brought into the Syrian agglomeration of adverse creeds and races, there was no field open for the new comers into the Turkish territory for proselytism, except that of Mohammedanism or of Judæism. The former, from the beginning, offered no hope of success at all, and none has been realised in it. The latter afforded no grounds for any expectation of success, except that amount of it which could be bought, and must be dearly paid for.

Any success, then, deserving of the name, that could be achieved by Protestant missionaries in Syria, must be obtained by proselytism directed against Roman Catholic communites, such as the Maronites and united Armenians, or against the orthodox Greek community; and it is hardly necessary to say that no success could be achieved in either of those Christian communities, (that had subsisted for centuries in the midst of Mohammedan persecution), by the missionaries of a religion, differing from theirs, recently introduced amongst them, without occasioning feelings of bitterness and sectarian hate—the most diabolical of all kind of hatred.

These feelings were indeed excited and exasperated to a great degree of fierce animosity at the time that the conspiracy was concocted in Constantinople against Christians in the Turkish empire, the first design of which was to effect the extermination of the Christians of all Christian sects in Syria, but

especially of the Maronites, and to make the Druses instrumental to the execution of this project.

This is the opinion of all the intelligent ecclesiastics, heads of houses and of orders, connected with Roman Catholic missions in Syria and Constantinople, whom I have met with in the East; and likewise of all those literary and political persons whom I have met with in France, by whom this subject has been studied with care, and with access to the reports of the Consuls in Syria, made to the French Government.

The facts in the various reports of the massacres, in those especially of an official character, that bear on this opinion of the Turkish origin of the Syrian massacres, are scattered over a vast number of documents, and thus separately encountered, do not strike the casual reader as strong evidence of the guilt of the contrivers of those massacres being Turks. It is only when one has given close and undivided attention to the several accounts, that a conclusion is come to, or rather is forced on him; namely, that it is impossible to understand the concurrence of numerous circumstances taking place at one time, corresponding in different districts, all tending to one point; the connivance at, and complicity with, the murderous acts of the Druses, without coming to the conclusion that these acts were planned, secretly suggested, counselled, and directed by Mussulmans for fanatical purposes.

We find by the official papers that the principal massacres all took place within a period of four or five weeks. That they were preceded by visits of Dervishes in several localities, whose mission seemed to be to stir up fanatical feelings, to preach up, in fact, a holy war.* The Turkish authorities of high rank, including the Pachas, Mudirs or Governors, with one or two

* July 8, 1858, just before the Syrian massacres of June and July, 1860, Consul Finn, of Jerusalem, writes to the Earl of Malmesbury, referring to the Mohammedan tumults and murders at Jeddo, observes, "In the presence of such events, it seems necessary to mention to your Lordship, what, at other times, might be scarcely worth reporting, namely, the great number of Durweeshes in our town, uttering fanatical cries and making processions, nearly naked. See Parl. Papers, No. 33.

honourable exceptions, invariably either connived at, or openly encouraged, the carnage and spoliation; so that, while the latter of the highest rank were brought to justice in considerable numbers, not one of the Druse Chiefs who took a leading part in the massacre, up to this hour, has been punished.

The recent massacres in Syria, I have good grounds for believing, were thus got up in Constantinople by the old fanatic party, who are still all-powerful in that city, and are countenanced and encouraged in their fanaticism, and their proceedings against Christians, by Abdul Azis, the brother of the late Sultan Abdul Medjid. In the month of August last I was in Egypt, a few months only after the Syrian massacres, and received much valuable information in relation to them from a French ecclesiastic at Alexandria—the head of a religious order, a gentleman of considerable eminence, remarkable for his attainments, and of the highest order of intelligence, who was, in virtue of his office, in communication with all the French clergy then on the mission in Syria, and, to my knowledge, in daily intercourse with the fugitives from Syria, who had fled during the massacres into Egypt, and were still remaining there. To that gentleman, who was in close communication, too, with the consular authorities of his nation in Syria, who had been there immediately before the outbreak of the Druses, and was cognisant of the mischievous designs that were then contemplated by the Druses, and the efforts that were then being made by the French Consul-general of Syria, in concert with the chief ecclesiastical authorities of the Maronites, to defeat them, I am largely indebted for authentic information on this subject. To the Superior of the Lazarist order in Alexandria I am likewise indebted for reliable information on the subject, which came directly from the scenes of those terrible atrocities, where the members of this order were on the mission, as, in point of fact, they are throughout the whole country.

Intimately acquainted as I was of old with that country, and the different races of it, that were then the subjects of my

inquiry, I was enabled to deal advantageously, I think, with the details then given me; and by other persons, subsequently, not of the clerical profession, nor of strong sympathies with the Maronites or their missionaries—by Englishmen who had been in Syria during the massacres, and had only recently left its shores. Every traveller, at least, must be aware there is no amount of knowledge to be gained from books, or got from verbal accounts given of scenes that have been witnessed by others, and of events that have occurred, which a previous knowledge of the place and people with which they are connected, will not enable one to form a juster estimate of, and a clearer conception of what ought to be received with caution, or required confirmation, or ought to be rejected altogether.

I have taken no small pains, both in France and England, since my return from the Levant, to put myself in possession of all official information, and likewise private communications giving all the reliable accounts of those deplorable transactions, that were procurable; and the results of these efforts will be found in the following pages. At the close of my literary career, I ardently desire, in this last work of mine, it may be found I have not been unfaithful to the interests of humanity in treating of Turkish atrocities, and massacres of Christians at the hands of Druses, which have met with apologists in high places; and have not allowed my judgment to be swayed by any influences, however high or popular.

One of my informants in my last visit to the East, in 1860, concerning the Syrian massacres, in whose statements I place full confidence, gave me to understand the origin of them had been clearly traced to his knowledge to the old fanatic Turkish party at Constantinople. By them a conspiracy was formed, the object of which was the extirpation of the Christians in the provinces, in the first instance. The brother of the Sultan was cognizant of this project. It was a part of a conspiracy on a great scale against the Giaours of the Turkish Empire. One of the great results expected from it was the calling into being such zeal for the cause of Islam throughout the provinces as would

inflame the hearts of true believers, and stir them up to wage a holy war against the existing reforming government.

On one occasion my informant was a guest of a wealthy Moslem merchant, at a déjeuner given by him some years ago, at Stamboul, in a kiosk in a beautiful garden in the vicinity of the Bosphorus, at which the present Sultan was also a guest. There were some Levantine Christians also at this entertainment, who had country houses in the vicinity of this hospitable merchant. After the repast the young Turkish prince walked with some of his Turkish friends to a part of the garden where poppies were grown in abundance. My informant's attention was drawn to this place by loud shouts of laughter, and, on reaching the spot, he found the hopeful heir to the Turkish throne, with his scymitar drawn, in the act of cutting down poppy heads "en masse," and showing the spectators, jocularly, how he would mow down the heads of Giaours, if he had as many thousands of them before him as there were poppies there to be swept off.

When the fanatics of Stamboul need the services of the dervishes for stirring up the embers of fanaticism, which, according to their notions of the requirements of the law of Islam, may have too long smouldered, crowds are collected in the vicinity of the principal mosques and harangued by the wily members of the confraternity of sanctimonious libertines, the profligate devotees, half saints, half maniacs, entire mountebanks; mockers of sacred things, and almost as irreverent in holy places, as Spanish and Italian sacristans—the dervishes of all religious orders.

The crowds have it dinged into their ears that the faith is in danger, the Koran is set at nought, trampled on by the giaours. The time is come for making war on the infidels—a holy war in defence of religion against the dogs of Christians! If the people are not sufficiently excited, a quarter of the city is burned down, and all the purposes are answered which the appearance of several leading articles, of more than ordinary

vehemence and vigour, in a great organ of public opinion would occasion in Europe.

And, finally, if a massacre is to be got up in Syria, a number of dervishes are dispatched to the various districts, where the conflicting influences of French, English and Russian consuls, and the widely separated interests and bitter contentions, and spiteful sectarian controversies of Protestant and Catholic missionaries, have produced the greatest rancour between Christians of different communities, or the deadliest animosity has been excited between Maronites and Druses.

It is complimentary to Turkish policy to find that Christian policy, in some countries peculiarly pure and perfect, and whose people are particularly jealous of their character for civilization, is indebted to the former largely for a discovery in the art of retaining power in provinces occupied rather than governed by their possessors. Maundrell, whose "Journey from Aleppo to Jerusalem, A.D. 1697," was published upwards of a century and a half ago, states that when he was travelling in Syria he encountered difficulties, and he tells us "They were caused by the embroylments and factions that were amongst the Arabs, which made us as desirous as possible to keep out of their way. 'Tis the policy of the Turks always to sow divisions amongst these wild people, by setting up several heads over their tribes, after deposing the old and placing new ones in their stead. *By which art they create contrary interests and parties amongst them*, preventing them from ever uniting under any one leader, which if they would have the sence to do (being so numerous, and almost the sole inhabitants thereabouts), they might shake off this Turkish yoke, and make themselves supreme lords of the country." *

Nothing in the way of recklessness of assertion can be more astounding than the solemn statements we read in the Parliamentary reports of the decline of fanaticism in Turkey; of the efficacy of the reforms of late years for the protection of the

* Maundrell's "Journey from Aleppo," 5th ed., p. 56.

Christian subjects of the Sultan; of the sufficiency of the power, and the sincerity of the intentions, of Turkish officials for the prevention of all persecution, and the punishment of any oppression at the hands of Moslems, or their ever-ready accomplices and partisans in schemes of wholesale murder and spoliation—the Druses. Let us see how these bold assertions of the champions and advocates of Turkish rule, and the protectors of its rapidly growing civilization are borne out by recent travellers in the Turkish dominions.

Some years previously to the recent massacres, the Hon. F. Walpole, in his "Travels in the Further East, the Ansayrii and the Assassins," gave a graphic account of the atrocities of Turkish rule in that part of Syria which he had visited.

"It may not be out of the way here to enter into the subject of the estimation in which this persecuted race is held, both by Turks and Christians. The Turks regard those who believe the Bible and Holy Writ as Giaours (Kafirs), perhaps infidels. This is the name used, the one word being Turkish, the other Arab; but all other sects they call Immamee, or without religion. The Christians, &c., probably are as little loved as the others, but they are now strong; as for 'these Immamee, these Ansayrii, it is better to kill one than to pray a whole day.' . . . .

"There can be no worse government than that of the Turks, for the delicate task of appeasing an excitable people. They can kill, massacre, destroy, pillage, rob, lie, and abuse to perfection; but as to assuaging the temper of the beaten, distracting their thoughts, reviving their spirits, conciliating or helping, such a thing is utterly incompatible with their natures. The Pacha sits in his serrai; he can never hear the truth; and, as among them from first to last, money is the sole object—to obtain that to-day, they would leave burning a light that would blow them up to-morrow!!

"A Christian and Mahometan prophecy had named the day next following the one after my arrival as that on which a rising was to take place. As the eve approached the fears

of the poor Christians were terrible. It seemed incredible that men could be such cowards; resistance was a word undreamt of in their utmost fancies. One or two young men were said to have died of fright. Yet they had foreseen this for weeks, had money to purchase arms, which were plentiful in the shops, had houses, natural fortresses. When spoken to, they regarded me with wonder. 'It is no use; for us there is no hope.' 'What!' I replied, 'are you men? Will you see your wives, your daughters, violated, your sons murdered, and not strike one blow?' They gazed, and passed on. May we not look at this as a great principal cause whereby five thousand Mussulmans were enabled to conquer this populous country, then overflowing with wealth? Their church also inculcated a passiveness, a submission, that has done more injury to them than all the swords and oppressions of the Turks. They must not boldly resist, bravely struggle, and die; but they may lie, fawn, creep, sneak, prevaricate and abuse."

In the Latakia district, where the people are more industrious, the Hon. Mr. Walpole says, the oppression of the Government is most severe. No portion of the Sultan's dominions was apparently more misgoverned. Tyranny and oppression, the law of the strong, and nowhere is there more oppression. The milder rule spreading elsewhere is here unknown. Murders are of daily occurrence: robbery perpetual, under such circumstances it may be well believed."

Be it observed that Mr. Walpole speaks of reformed Turkish government in this district of Latakia in the year 1851, when the famous charter of Turkish liberty, justice and protection for all subjects of the Sultan, the Tanzimat, was in existence on paper, the original locked up in the Royal Treasury in the same chamber with the old black woollen garment of the Prophet Mohammed.

"It would occupy too long a space (says Mr. Walpole) to relate the differences existing amongst the sects in the East, and I must refer the reader to Gibbon or to Robertson. The hatred of one sect for the other is an increasing feeling, fos-

tered by ignorance and passion. At present all hope of a change is faint, and we must leave it in the hands of God, using our best efforts to second the good work a few humble men have taken in hand.

"In fine the traveller will find, with surprise, the hate and rancour existing between the sects; and that the Christians have more love and charity for the Mussulman or idolator, than they have for the Christian of another sect; and he will hear blasphemies uttered against things he holds sacred, because they are regarded either a hair's breadth more or less by another."*

The testimony of Mr. Walpole is borne to the fanaticism of the Turks of Damascus—"The Turks of Damascus, so famed for their fanaticism, but late acts of the Consuls had conciliated them."

And this fanaticism we find ascribed to the fidelity of their religious principles:—"Many old and fine families of Mussulmans reside there, and also there is, what elsewhere in the Ottoman dominions has no existence, an hereditary Saracenic nobility—families descendant from the conquerors—collateral descendants of Abou Bekr and others, who for years have given Pashas to the empire."

Aleppo is hardly inferior in its fanaticism to Damascus.

Mr. Walpole tells us:—"Its plains and wells have drunk deeply of blood. It has heard that dreadful cry, 'Allah Akbar, Allah Akbar, Alamlah, Alamlah, Aljannah, Aljannah!" God is great, God is great; fight, fight; Paradise, Paradise! And recent events teach us that the sound still lurks in the throats of the Turks. A word will bring it forth, and then they will spring on the Christian, hateful, ferocious, savage, as of yore. Well then can we understand how proud was Othello's boast, when in fair Venice's palmy days—

> "In Aleppo once,
> Where a malignant and a turbaned Turk,
> Beat a Venetian, and traduced the state,
> I took by the throat the circumcised dog,
> And smote him."†

* Walpole's Travels in the East, vol 1, p. 401.
† Walpole's Travels in the East, vol. 1, p. 229.

The sword of Islam is the sword of salvation and damnation, the key that opens the door of death, conducting Mahommed to heaven, Christians, Jews and all other infidels to hell. The Koran tells its true believers—"A drop of blood shed in the cause of God, a night passed in arms, is of more avail than two months of fasting and of prayer."

M. Blanqui, a member of the Institute of France, in 1843 published his "Voyage en Bulgarie, Pendant l'Année 1841," in which he has given an account of the massacres committed by the Turks on the Christian inhabitants in that country a short time previous to his travels in it.

The frightful details of carnage and pillage carried into execution so recently by Turkish troops with entire impunity; nay, even with the connivance of the authorities, shews but too plainly that Turkish fanaticism is as formidable to the Christian communities of Turkey as it ever was.

The wholesale massacres of Christian Rayahs, subjects of the Ottoman Empire in the Pachalisks of Mosul and Bagdad and the territory between the shores of the Persian Gulph and of the Euxine, even during the reign of the late Sultan, have been noticed in the works of Bishop Southgate, Longworth, Layard, and MacFarlane. The unhappy Nestorian Christians, who dwell in the vicinity of the Mussulman Kurds were the chief sufferers in these recent massacres.

Two of these massacres are attributed to not only the connivance at, but the active impulse given to the fanaticism of the murderous Kurds, over whom he ruled. The first massacre was perpetrated with impunity.

The second, in 1846, called forth a show of dissapprobation at Stamboul. Reschid Pascha, then Grand Vizier, sent an Imperial commissioner, Nazim Effendi to enquire into the circumstances of Bedr-Khan's renewed atrocities.

No sooner did he reach Mosul than he had an interview with the sanguinary monster, and the result of that interview was, the Commissioner was bribed "with large sums of money and would receive no evidence against him." The Commissioner had conferences with the French and English Consuls on the

subject of the late massacre of the Nestorian Christians, and the reply we are told to their complaints by the Commissioners was "as false as it was savage." I have read a reply of a recent date, given by a statesman in the British House of Commons, to the complaints that were forced on his attention of a massacre of Roman Catholic Christians committed in Syria by the Druses, with the connivance of the Turkish authorities, and the answer given to those complaints was precisely similar in its character to that which MacFarlane has justly stigmatised as being "as false as it was savage."

"Far from seeking (says MacFarlane) to deny or palliate the atrocious circumstances of the massacre, the Turkish Commissioner, Nazim Effendi, openly justified them, and said that the Nestorians were rebellious infidels, whom it was the duty of all religious Mussulmans to exterminate: and when asked what provocation had been given by these poor Christians, he repeated an absurd story which had been trumped up by Bedr-Khan-Bey, in justification of the first great massacre he had perpetrated three years ago, and in which 10,000 of the Nestorians had perished: the story that some green turbaned Turks, Emirs, settlers in the neighbourhood of the Christians, had been murdered by them. There was not a word of truth in the original statement."

Some Moslem peasants who had intruded on the territory of the Nestorians, were, on the complaint of the Christians, removed by the Pacha of Mosul to another part of the country; and on their retiring it was maliciously said that the green turbaned Moslems had been assassinated. Upon this flimsy foundation, Nazim Effendi had the audacity to assert that Bedr-Khan-Bey was justified in his indiscriminate massacre of 2,000 more Christian subjects of the Sultan Abdul Medjid.

"Not a Mussulman had been killed by the Nestorians (said the Consuls), the men reported to be dead are living, and in good health not far off."

But even admitting that murders had been committed by

the Christians, ought not some distinction be made between the innocent and the guilty? Ought not the women and children of the Nestorians at least to have been spared?

The Imperial Commissioner, Nazim Effendi only replied that they (the Nestorians) were all infidels—all the same dirt, and deservedly consigned to the same fate.

MacFarlane adds—"I state these particulars on the authority of a friend, who is also the friend of Mr. Layard, and was then, as well as Mr. Layard, in the country at the time of Nazim Effendi's visit."*

One of the notable Turkish massacres of modern times, since the much vaunted reform of Ottoman Government, which M. Blanqui refers to, was perpetrated in Bulgaria on the Christian Rayahs of that province by an army of 7,000 savage Arnaout soldiery, let loose on them by Mustapha Pacha in 1843.

This massacre was the result of an unsuccessful effort of an abortive insurrection of the Christians in a mountainous district, in which some Turkish soldiers (cavalry) had been defeated and slain. M. Blanqui visited the scene of these horrors in August, 1841, when he says he found bands of wild Arnaouts, who had ravaged the country with fire and sword, still lingering in various places, and the plains of Nissa and Jopha, militarily occupied by more than 20,000 men of the Sultan's (so called) regular army, with a numerous artillery. Here and there he saw houses burned, fruit trees torn up by the roots and women and children wandering about the woods and wasted fields. In one district there was nothing but terror and traces of devastation. The peasants said, "Give us arms; if we had but arms we would soon drive these wild beasts out of the woods."

"The insurrection (says M. Blanqui) was suppressed, but terror reigned in all hearts. One must have seen the sombre despair of the Bulgarian peasants, and the insolence of the Albanian hordes, to form an idea of what this Christian popu-

* Turkey and its Destiny, vol. 2, p. 57.

lation must have suffered during this short and sad period. Europe, which takes so lively an interest in the Arican negroes, is not sufficiently aware that there exists at her gates, or as one may say in her bosom, some millions of men, Christians like ourselves, who are treated as dogs in their quality of Christians, under a Government to which all Christian powers send Christian ambassadors."

Well may M. Blanqui say, the Hatti Scheriffe of Gul-Hana has been "*an atrocious deception.*"

The recent massacres in Syria now claim our attention.

The events which recently purpled the soil of Syria did not break out suddenly.

European agents, secret and public, were the immediate promoters of them; but for two years previously the Turks openly prepared these results. The Turkish officials of the Porte in Syria left no efforts untried to revive all the old differences between the Druses and the Maronites. They excited some of the most hot-headed of the latter against the Druses, and persuaded them that circumstances were favourable to make war on the enemies of their faith; while, on the other hand, they urged on the common enemy of Christians and Mohammedans to profit by their military superiority to crush the worshippers of Christ, and to enrich themselves by plunder.

These animosities and hostilities, which had for a long time been in preparation and course of encouragement, broke out vehemently and of a sudden, *apparently*, in the early part of June, 1860.

But a year previously there had been contentions and conflicts between them.

On the 15th of August, 1859, a quarrel about a sheep became the pretext of a furious battle between the Druses and the Maronite Christians, which terminated in the complete conflagration of the mixt village of Beit-meri, where these disturbances had taken place. At one time it was feared that the two parties, who divide between them the Lebanon, would

rise en masse against the other, and renew the war of 1845. But the prompt and energetic measures of the Consuls on that occasion put a stop to hostilities. Besides, it appeared that the Turks did not then find things yet ripe for the execution of their plans, and feared that in rising too soon that they would only miscarry. In effect, Kourchid Pacha, Governor-general of Beyrout, of whose infamous conduct in the recent tragedies of 1860 we have heard so much, displayed, in 1859, the greatest activity in putting down the conflict in which the two parties were engaged. This conflict, however, served him as a pretext for establishing, for some months, a camp of Turkish troops at Djounih, in the very heart of Kesraouan. In the Turkish camp there were active and energetic fanatic emissaries of the anti-Christian Ulema party of Constantinople, who penetrated into the Christian districts of the Lebanon, secretly, and excited the Maronite peasants against the Emirs, and completed the disorganisation of the Christian districts by inciting them against their rulers and their enemies, and creating a spirit of tumult and disorder.

The winter of 1859 thus passed on without effecting anything but a great agitation throughout all parts of the Lebanon, and a feeling of consternation and apprehension of danger at the hands of the Druses. On all sides they prepared themselves for a struggle that was imminent, and some of the Maronite merchants and capitalists of Beyrout, who acted as bankers and agents to their co-religionists, used their last endeavours to procure and distribute in the Christian portion of the mountains, muskets and ammunition, to put the population, who had been almost entirely disarmed since the events of 1845, in a state to defend themselves, in case of any aggression on the part of the Druses.

In fine, in the latter part of the spring of 1860, the Mussulman organizers of the affair, and their abettors among the enemies of the Maronites, judged the moment had arrived for the explosion of their foul conspiracy. Kassim-Bey, a Druse sheik in the service of Saïd-Bey-Djemblat, one of the protegés

of the English missionaries, and one of the most influential chiefs of the Druse district, came and established himself close to Sayda, followed by some Druses and Mussulmans of Aglin-el-Arkoub. Emissaries of other Druse chiefs did the same thing near Beyrout.

On the 26th of April, Kassim-Bey came to the city, and had with the *Mudir*, or governor, of Sayda a long interview, of which nothing ever transpired. The following day, a great agitation among the Mussulman population was observed. They procured arms in the town, at any price. The same day, the 27th of April, three Christians of the village of Katouli were assassinated by the Druses of the suite of Kassim Bey.

From that time not a day passed that some isolated Christian was not murdered in one or other of the Druse districts. The most talked-of of these assassinations was that of a Maronite priest.

Nevertheless it was still hoped by the well-disposed that events would at least retard the breaking out of any further disturbances till the end of winter, and that might, perhaps, be able to ward them off altogether. In fact, the time was approaching for gathering in the silk, and, as any interruption to the harvest causes an equal injury to the Druses and Maronites, ordinarily, even in the most bitter wars, all hostility ceases at that period.

But this hope was very soon dispelled. The 14th of May an engagement between the two rival populations took place in the environs of Sayda. The Christians of Katouli, assailed by the Druses, defended themselves with their guns, killed two of the aggressors and wounded a third. This resistance was only a stimulus for further excesses on the part of the Druses. The secret interviews of Kassim-Bey and the *Mudir* of Sayda became more and more frequent. Encamped at the gate of the town, Kassim-Bey made his own men search all the Christians who went out, took away their arms and ammunition, only allowing the Turks and the Druses to go in and

out freely, to arm themselves, and provide themselves with powder and bullets.

Assassinations multiplied fast. The 18th of May, at the sequel of a quarrel between a Christian and a Mussulman of El Arkoub, the latter was wounded by the cut of a knife. The Christian was arrested, but that did not suffice for Kassim-Bey and those for whom he was agent. He took the wounded Mussulman, and had him transported to the town of Sayda, followed by some hundreds of Druses, crying out to the Mussulmans that it was a dog of a Christian who had wounded one of their people, and that they must be revenged. They hoped, in all probability, to bring about by that means an immediate rising of the Mussulman population, and thus effect a massacre of the Christians; but, by the intervention of some influential and energetic persons, the danger was averted, and this diabolical project only had the effect of augmenting the excitement of the Mussulman population.

While things were in this alarming state at Sayda and its environs, the situation of the districts around Beyrout was sufficiently grave. The state of affairs in the town itself soon became so menacing that, on the 20th of May, the principal merchants of Beyrout met in one of the rooms of the Ottoman Bank, and signed a petition, addressed to the Consuls of the different Powers, praying them to interest themselves with the Pacha to adopt prompt and effective measures, with the view of maintaining the safety of the city and the peace of the mountain, as absolutely necessary for the continuance of commercial transactions.

Two days after, a slight action took place on the borders of Nahar-Beyrout—one might almost say at the very gates of the city. Ten or twelve Druse peasants came in search of some of their people employed in the spinning manufactory near the river, to take them up to the mountain. They met some Christians, armed like themselves. First words, then insults, were exchanged on each side, and from insulting language they came to blows. A fire of musketry was employed,

in which it is acknowledged by persons friendly to the Maronites, the first shots were fired by the Christians. The Druses intrenched themselves in a house, where they were assailed; and when this bloody conflict terminated, one Druse was stretched dead on the floor, and two others seriously wounded, as also one Christian, who was immediately carried to the hospital of the French Sisters of Charity.

This fray, or battle, as it was called, at Nahar-Beyrout, added to the circumstance that, when hostilities became more serious, the first house set on fire at Beit-Meri, in the midst of the firing, was the house of a Druse, caused many persons in Beyrout to be told, that although the Christians were without doubt terrible sufferers subsequently at the hands of the Druses, the fault was their own, and that they had drawn upon themselves this misfortune, by having first attacked the Druses, who were not thinking of making war on them, and had no idea of molesting them. Nothing is more unfounded than this opinion, and nothing more untrue than the statement that the Druses had entered into no conspiracy against the the Christians, nor had not overtly acted against them. The statement is sufficiently refuted by the facts which persons on the spot, and who had been cognizant of those occurrences from first to last have related.

The writer on the recent massacres in Syria, whose account of their origin, progress, and results, is most worthy of credit, is Monsieur F. Lenormant, an eye-witness of many of the catastrophes he has so accurately described in his excellent narrative, "Les Dernieres Evenements en Syrie," has made some excellent observations on this subject which I would commend and recommend to the careful attention and dispassionate consideration of any statesmen and politicians whose sympathies, unfortunately, on this occasion, are not on the side of the oppressed, but of those by whom humanity has been outraged; not on the side of the Christians who have been massacred, but of the enemies of Christianity, by whom a frightful carnage of Christians has been perpetrated; I would call the attention

to those statements of persons whose first concern in this instance, is not for the interests of civilisation, but for the character and prestige of a government so rotten, and steeped in corruption as this Turkish regime, which in the words of Macchiavelli, "Puzzo nell' naso dell Europa."

"The question (says Monsieur Lenormant) is very immaterial whether it was a Maronite or a Druse who fired the first shot. The person who should be responsible for the consequences is not the one who does the first act, but he who has taken time in preparing and provoking it. When it is the government, when they have the disposal of material force, of money, and a thousand other means of intrigue, it is always easy when a war or an insurrection breaks out, to make those whom they wish to crush commence the struggle, and thus to make themselves appear in the wrong. But an impartial observer must not allow himself to be caught by this snare, and from beneath the mask of hypocrisy he must expose the truly guilty.

Thus, even though we admit that there was not sufficient provocation for the assassinations committed in Metri and around Sayda; even though one would not wish to see an opening of hostilities in the rash enterprise of Katouli where the Druses had been the aggressors, nor even in the scuffle of Nahar-Beyrout, where the first blows were struck by the Christians; it must not necessarily follow that the first fault of it should be thrown back upon the Maronites. In fact, the true guilty party, the only instigator of the late events in Syria, he who prepared everything for the last two years, was neither the Maronite people, nor yet the Druse people, it was the Turkish authorities themselves, the agents of the Porte, the Pacha of Beyrout, and *perhaps even a still higher power.* *

Moreover, the culpability of the Turkish authorities will be more evidently set forth in the subsequent events. The real culprit alluded to in the concluding observations of Monsieur Lenormant, and spoken of mysteriously, as "perhaps even a

* Lenormant's "Les Dernieres Evenements de Syrie. Par. 1860. p. 22.

higher power," than the Pacha of Beyrout, or any other Ottoman authority in Syria, though not named, I have good reason to believe *is no less a personage than Abdul Medjid the brother of the then Sultan.*

Monsieur le Comte de Vogue, in his account of the Syrian massacres, "Les Evenements de Syrie," referring to the origin of the disturbances, says, that "For two years previously to the outbreak (in May, 1860), a silent agitation prevailed in the Lebanon. To the ordinary vexations which the Maronites experienced at the hands of the Druses, secretly instigated by the Turks, a new cause of excitement was added. Opinions adverse to the government began to extend over the mountain, not only the Christian sheiks had driven away the Kaimakam officer set over them by the government (Beschir-Abou-Ellameh), but even the Maronite peasantry rose against their sheiks, refused to acknowledge their authority, and gave themselves up to all kinds of disorders.

The Emirs had been plundered, and driven from their castles; a farrier, the leader of the insurrection, had taken the title of Bey; and that organization, which until then had been the strength of the mountain, was now threatened with complete dissolution. The Maronite clergy have been reproached with having encouraged this revolt, and excited the people against their masters, with the view of lessening their authority to their own advantage. This accusation is exaggerated, and the result has done them justice: the clergy, in allowing this agitation to go on, believed themselves destined to succeed to the inheritance of the political influence of the deposed sheiks. The instigation emanated from higher quarters.

It is now very clear that they proceeded from the Turkish Government who preceded the massacre by intriguing, and dividing the population with the object of crushing them more easily.

Dieu veuille que les agents Anglais aient été etrangers á ces machinations, et que, volontairement ou non, ils n'aient pas

servi d'instruments au plus infâme des gouvernements contre la plus noble des causes !

Whilst the Maronites, yielding to these culpable instigations were thus working their own ruin, the Druses, the objects of the complacency of the Ottoman authorities, drew their ranks closer, and strengthened the feudal bonds which attached them to the ancient families of their Emirs, to Dymblat, to Nakad, to Hamadê. Under these circumstances the war broke out, but from the very first it was easy to foretell what would be its issue ; on the one side, a brave people, but without arms, without chiefs, without organization ; on the other side, warlike tribes perfectly armed, led on by chiefs habituated to command them, possessed by religious fanaticism, and openly sustained by the agents of the highest authority.

The hostilities commenced at the end of 1859, and were continued for some time without marked advantage being gained on either side ; this first struggle did not assume a formidable aspect, and the intervention of the consuls put an end to it. It was confined to some musket shots, and some houses burnt, about Beit Meri and in Metri. The peace was not of long duration, the assassinations increased, sinister rumours circulated, the attitude of the Mussulmans in the towns became threatening ; bands of Druses were seen each day coming to Beirout, and the other seaport towns to supply themselves with arms and ammunition ; all announced that a terrible explosion was imminent.

The consuls, at this juncture, made representations to Kourschid Pacha, who made fair promises and kept none of them. They addressed themselves to the Druse chiefs who had the principal influence in the mixed districts and particularly to Said Bey Djemblad (one of the principal instigators of the massacres of the Maronites, subsequently tried, convicted, and sentenced to death, but pardoned in consequence of the interference on his behalf of the British ambassador at the Porte, Sir Henry Bulwer), to Abou Nakad, to Bechir Bey and to

Sheik Hamade. These chiefs replied in pacific terms to the messengers sent to them, and declared the Christians had nothing too fear from them. Nevertheless, the preparations "for war" went on amongst them, and several skirmishes took place in the vicinity of Deir-el-Kamar, and on the plain of Rahhè.

The Maronites saw the necessity of assuming a defensive attitude, after various individual murders of their people in different localities, and wrecking of isolated houses of Christians, not only at the commencement, but in the progress of this persecution, very like what took place at the hands of Orangemen in the north of Ireland, some sixty-four years ago. At this juncture it was that Kourshid Pacha, under pretext of pacification and interposition, in the interests of humanity, between the combatants, took his departure from Beyrout, the 29th May, 1860, with about a thousand men, and encamped near Baabda, about seven miles distance from the town at the entrance to the defiles of the mountain.

It is the custom when the Mushir sets out on any military expedition, that salutes are fired from the batteries of the castle. The salute on the present occasion, was the pre-concerted signal of the Mushir and the Druse chiefs, for an onslaught on the Christians of all the neighbouring towns and villages. At the sound of the discharge of the first cannon, fires were lighted on the heights in all the adjoining districts inhabited by Druses; the houses of the Christians of Beit-Meri were soon after surrounded and ransacked (the inmates having fled in terror at the approach of the Druses and their Turkish allies), and set on fire, and in a short time the line of mountains which forms the background of Beirout, was lit up at intervals not widely separated, with the flames of the houses of the Christian population of that part of the Lebanon.

At Meten all the adjacent villages and detached houses of the Christians were assailed by the Druse and Turk wreckers and murderers, but in this district they were stoutly resisted and repulsed, and driven back to Ras-El-Meten, of which district

several Druse villages were sacked and burned by the Maronites, in reprisal for the previous wrecking and burning, of Christian villages by the Druses.

While these occurrences were taking place, Kourschid Pacha let loose the most ferocious of his soldiers, the Bashi-Bazouks, on the Maronites. The latter, in their astonishment and confusion at this unexpected attack of the Turkish force, avowedly in the field for their protection, fled in all directions, and in their flight numbers of them were cut down by their assailants. Then commenced the indiscriminate massacre of all Christians, not only in this district, but in the adjacent localities. The wrecking of houses and plundering of them, the slaughter of old and young, carrying away into slavery of the women who were young, became general wherever Turkish soldiers were in the localities that were the scenes of those disorders, they aided and abetted the Druses in their work of carnage and depredation.

Kourschid Pacha had taken effectual measures to prevent the Maronites of the southern districts of the Lebanon from receiving any succour from the more resolute and warlike Christians of their race, of the northern districts. He had pitched his camp in the immediate vicinity of the route which connects Meten with Kesrouan.

The Turkish authorities could have easily maintained tranquillity, after the collision between the Druses and Maronites, at Nahar Beyrout, on the 22nd of May, 1860, if they had desired to have done so. But they took no measures whatsoever to preserve order, and on the day following that collision, a Maronite was murdered with entire impunity at Dair-el-Kamar by the Druses. The infamous governor of Beyrout indeed at this period was taking measures for the accomplishment in his province, of the Constantinopolitan conspiracy against the Christians.

He then had only 750 of the Nizam troops, or regular infantry, at his disposal, but he dispatched messengers to Damascus, Naplous, and Jerusalem, for reinforcements, and from all the

adjacent districts he collected a horde of undisciplined, ferocious mercenaries, differently armed and accoutred, Bashi-Bazouks, Arnaouts, or Albanians, Turks of Tripoli, and Bedouins of the Nomade tribes of the uncultivated plains of the Bekhâa. These constituted the principal part of the forces with which Kourschid Pacha proceeded from Beyrout on the 29th of May, 1860, and encamped at about two hours' distance near the village of Baabda.

This strange proceeding of Kourschid Pacha, soon ceased to be so unaccountable as it appeared at first to be, both to the Christian inhabitants of Beirout, and of the Lebanon. Subsequent events plainly proved his object was to withdraw himself from the importunities of the consuls, and to put himself in a direct and commodious position for relations with the Druses.

The very day that Kourchid Pasha encamped at Baabda, on the 29th of May, the first serious conflict took place between the Druses and the Maronites. The two parties from noon to midnight maintained a murderous though desultory warfare, assailing one another in the streets and in their houses, shooting indiscriminately each other's families.

In the burning of houses those of the Christians which were first destroyed, were set fire to by a troop of the Albanian irregular soldiers, thirty or forty in number, who were posted in the unfortunate village of Beit Meri for the protection of the inhabitants.

When the village was a heap of ruins the two parties fled about midnight in different directions: the Christians proceeded to Ain-Sadee, the residence of the Maronite Bishop Tobias, and the Druses repaired to Abadiyeh, their headquarters.

It was while the conflict was going on at Beit Meri that the Druses of Meten burned the Christian quarter of the village of Arsoun—the Maronite villages also of Keneisch and Zendouka and some other hamlets thinly inhabited. After these exploits, the triumphant Druses fell back on the locality of Ras-el-Meten, where their principal strength is in point of population.

On the 30th, the Druse devastations extended all around Beyrout. The whole country surrounding the place where Kourschid Pacha had so strangely encamped: the Maronite villages of Baabda, Areya, El Hadeth, Kefr Sshima, and seven others were wrecked and burned. One might have imagined they were witnessing a wrecking scene performed in Ireland: a fourth of July fusilade of Romanists at the hands of Armagh Orangemen.

Wherever there was a wrecking and a burning of houses, and a carnage of Christians, the Turkish Baschi Bazouks, who formed part of the Pachas troops encamped near Baabda, were sure to be seen mingling with the Druses and lending willing hands in the work of death and devastation.

The savagery of these ferocious soldiers of the Governor of Beyrout was such that even the Druses, with whom they were leagued, on some occasions expressed disgust at their horrible acts of cruelty—acts of unparalleled atrocity except at the hands of Turkish soldiers on Christian enemies.

Generally speaking the Druses spared women and very young children throughout the whole period of the massacres, but neither women nor children of any age or of either sex, were spared by the Turkish soldiers.

The Baschi Bazouks in particular, distinguished themselves by the horrible outrages they perpetrated, not only in mangling their victims, but in violating the very women they subsequently murdered, and grasping little children by a leg or an arm, and then slashing at their bodies with their yaticans, till the little creatures were literally cut to pieces.

So much for the Turkish soldiers who are the champions of the fanaticism of the Ottoman Empire.

As for the governor Khourchid, far from interposing to arrest the burnings and massacres, far from endeavouring to restrain his soldiers, or to march against them the regular troops he had to dispose of, he remained quietly seated at the door of his tent, gravely smoking his pipe and looking on at the burning of the christian villages. That of Baabda was pillaged and

destroyed at not more than a distance of two lengths of the sword from his very tent, without his moving from his state of impassibility. He did not confine himself to that; he encouraged by gesture and voice, in treating the destroyers as heroes and defenders of the true faith. However, at the close of the day, he made a sort of pretended demonstration of his impartiality and energy in the work of re-establishing peace.

Therein consisted the demonstration. Two shots of cannon *with powder*, were fired upon a party of Druses who were near camp, and several shots of cannon of *case shot*, were fired upon a troop of 500 Christians, who came from a neighbouring town under the command of a certain Toussoun-Schein, to the succour of their brethren who were attacked.

In effect, the Maronites made a vigorous resistance, though far worse armed and organized than their aggressors. On many points even they had the upper hand. The Christians of Meten, recovered from the first surprise that the attack of the city had occasioned them, repulsed the Druses, and in their turn assuming the part of the offensive, set fire to that portion of the non-christian village of Arsoun as also to that of Bzibdin and Kournayil.

The same day, the large and beautiful christian village of Hammanan was assailed by a strong party of Druses. Many of the inhabitants took flight, but about fifty men remained behind to defend their homes, and fought heroically for five consecutive hours. At length the Druses had reinforcements and remained masters of the village. The women and children who had not fled towards Beyrout, had found refuge in the French spinning manufactory, superintended by M. Bertrand. That establishment was spared. But in the same village was installed the administration of the works of a carriage roadway from Beyrout to Damascus, undertaken by a French company. The persons of the agents of this company were respected, and the effects of the manufactory were saved; but those of the engineer and of several other officers were pillaged, as well as the plans, estimates and business of the route, which they hastened to burn

as some witchcraft of the French. The house in which was installed the management of the roadway to Damascus, had hoisted the tricoloured standard as a signal for protection. The sight of this flag, so much respected up to this time, whose folds covered with inviolable protection whoever hoisted it, did not for a moment arrest the Druses, and after having been pillaged, the house that it surmounted was destroyed by fire. Interrogated about the difference of their conduct, relative to the establishment of M. Bertrand, and the house of the agents of the roadway to Damascus, the Druses replied that they received orders to spare the spinning manufactory but nothing else.

To close the scenes of the 30th of May, it now remains to speak of the fate of the inhabitants of El-Mouh-allakah-ed-Damour.

It is a village situated near the borders of the large river Damour, at the extreme south of the plain of Beyrout. The population, who were all Christians, had abandoned their homes from the early morning, and went to take shelter in Beyrout, confiding in the promises of the Pacha, when it was surrounded and assailed by the Druses and the Bashi-Bazouks, who there massacred an immense number of women and children, who, utterly terror stricken, allowed their throats to be cut without any resistance.

The day of the 31st of May witnessed the last efforts of any resistance of the Christians in the environs of Beyrout. They had had some success the previous day. But in order to maintain this good fortune it was necessary that the Christians of the districts where the fight had taken place should not remain unassisted.

They required the support of the population of the entire Christian districts, particularly that of the neighbours, the warlike inhabitants of Kesrouan, the terror of the Druses. Now, Khourchid Pacha, in establishing his camp at Baabda, found himself, by some chance, which appears singularly premeditated, to have intercepted the only route by which the people of Kesrouan could come to the succour of the Maronites

where the struggle had commenced. Moreover, in ordering the cannon to be fired on the eve upon the troop of Tousson-Scheïn, he had given a proof that if the warriors of Kesrouan advanced towards Meten, he would oppose their march by force.

Nevertheless on the morning of the 31st, a band of Christians came from all parts of Meten, and with a force of two or three hundred men, following up the offensive reprisal of the previous day by the Maronites, attacked the Druses in their principal quarter of Abâdêyeh. Unfortunately the elements of which this band was composed, had neither homogenity nor cohesion, and they lacked an able commander. The Druses, commanded by their Emirs, marched out from Abâdêyeh to the number of eight hundred, and burned eight or ten villages of the Lebanon in the vicinity of Beyrout. In one moment Deir-el-Kalaah, Ain-Bardé, Ain-Saadé, Broummana, Mar-Ischaya, Babdat, and Behannis became a prey to the flames. The entire mountain was covered with fire, and one heard resound in all directions detonations of shots. The village of Boumi alone in all that region opposed resistance sufficiently energetic and persevering to tire out the efforts of the Druses, aided by the Bashi-bazouks, and to preserve themselves from destruction.

A few minutes after, another troop of four or five hundred Druses sallied out from Ras-el-Meten, came down to the district of Meten, and set fire to every thing that was yet standing in the Christian villages and hamlets. Arbânîyeh, Dleïbir, Esch-Schouweïra, the Convent of Keneïseh, which had been spared the day before in the burning of the neighbouring village, were now destroyed from top to bottom. The same band passed at the foot of the French spinning manufactory of Aïn-Hamadé, under the direction of M. Mourgue; but in consequence of the orders given to respect establishments of that nature, the Druses did not attempt any violence against the spinning manufactory. They endeavoured, on the contrary, to reassure the

director: "Fear nothing," they cried out in passing by, "remain quietly at home, no one will trouble you."

The same day, the 31st, other bands of Druses and of Baschi-Bazouks spread themselves throughout the village of Hammana and Korreh, and reduced to ashes all the houses of the Christians. In a word, the Druse movement became more and more organized, and the destruction of the entire of the Maronite dwellings, as well as the massacre of the inhabitants was accomplished in a methodical manner throughout the whole districts of Meten and Ghourl, so that nothing escaped the hands of the destroyers. Nevertheless, in the midst of all this destruction, the spinning manufactory of M. M. Portalis, at Blathir, and that of a Greek, an ancient officer of the French marines, M. Veltakis, at El-Meteïn, were spared like those of Hammana and Aïn-Hamadé, and by the same orders. M. M. Portalis had even the courage, which cannot be too much praised, to open his spinning manufactory as a refuge for Christians who were driven from the environs; and, although seeing that, the most furious in the massacre amongst the Druses halted at the threshold of the door, without daring to go beyond, so precise were the orders they had received.

Within three days, sixty villages, rich and flourishing the day before, had been reduced to a heap of shapeless ruins.

Seeing the conduct of the Pacha, and aware also that a party of the Turkish troops had joined their enemies to attack them, the Christians of Meten and of Ghourl had lost all courage to defend themselves. Soon was to be seen a distracted crowd hurrying to Beyrout to seek refuge in the churches, in the consulates, and in private houses, the cut-throats pursuing them to the gates of the city.

The terror in Beyrout was general: people barricaded themselves in their houses, preparing for sustaining a siege. At night the terror was still greater.

There exists on the road to Damascus, near the gates of the city, a magnificent wood of pines, planted by the Emir Fakr-ed-

Din, a wood, to the description of which, M. Lamartine has consecrated several passages; it is called the Champs-Elysées, of Beyrout. "There, every day in time of peace, the people of the city resorted, on horseback or in carriages, to take the air. The Druses and the Baschi-Bazouks, continuing their exploits, came as far as this place, and there set fire to some houses. *

We read in a correspondence from Beyrout, dated 4th July, the following accounts of the frightful events which took place at Deir-el-Kammar :—

"Situated in the centre of a mixed district, in a strong position, Deir-el-Kammar was a rich and industrious city. At the end of the war in 1845, the administration of its affairs under a Druse *caimacan*, was abolished, the Druse placed under the authority of a direct Turkish governor, and at the beginning of the actual troubles, the Maronite inhabitants had manifested their intention not to take any part in them. The evening before the attack, the governor of Beyrout, Kourchid-Pacha, had written to felicitate them on their conduct, and to give them a formal assurance that he commanded the troops of the Sultan, who were in garrison at Beit-ed-din, to defend them against their enemies.

Friday, the 1st of June, 1860, about mid-day, whilst confiding in those promises, the people thought themselves in safety, the Druse Sheiks Abon Nacad, Amad-et-Hamadé, surrounded the Deir-el-Kammar with their contingents, and began the attack.

Taken by surprise and astonished to find that notwithstanding the assurances of the Muschir, the garrison, instead of repulsing the Druses, had retired to their barracks and had shut their doors, the inhabitants did not the less defend themselves with courage. The firing lasted till nine o'clock at night. The old men, the women, the children, and all those who were unable to fight, went to the palace of the governor and to the barracks to ask for asylum: but the soldiers refused to re-

* Les Derniers Evenements de Syrie. Par Francois Lenormant. Paris, 1860.

ceive them. Those only who could pay a considerable sum for the precarious hospitality, had been let in.

The following day, the Druses renewed the combat ; the principal men of the city at length went to the governor and to the commander of the troops, to implore of them either to give them assistance according to the orders of Kourchid-Pacha, or to supply them at least with arms, of which they stood in need to repel themselves the enemy.

They were told, that the soldiers could neither defend them, nor furnish them with arms, but that the authorities advised them to address themselves to Sayd-Bey-Djemblat, and likewise to Beschir-Bey-Abou-Macad, and to deliver up their arms to those two Sheiks. The Chiefs wrote at length to Sayd-Djemblat, who was at the time at Beteddin, with Abd-el-Salam-Bey, Turkish officer of the troops, a letter in which they made overtures of submission, and begging him to command the Druses to retire.

In reply to this letter, Sayd-Bey made the latter retire, but the following day, they returned, again surrounded the town, intercepted the roads that led to it, and massacred the inhabitants who attempted to leave it. The governor on his side, enjoined the inhabitants of Der-el-Kammar not to leave it, declaring that he would not be answerable for the consequences that might ensue to them if they infringed his orders.

At the same time the governor received in his palace with all possible honours the Sheiks Selim and Abou Nacad, who went there accompanied by a numerous suite of Druses.

On Sunday night the general of division, Taher Pacha, who was sent from Beyrout, arrived at Der-el-Kamer, with one hundred soldiers. The Druse chiefs preceded him and accompanied him to the seraglio.

There he had the chief men called before him, and assured them that the *Muschir*, knowing their devotion to the Porte and desirous to protect tham in a special manner, had sent to him to defend them against their enemies in case the latter should again attack them. After this declaration, he went to

Beteddin, and left the detachment he had taken with him at Der-el-Kammar.

The following day, Taher-Pacha had the chief men again called before him at Beteddin, and after having renewed the promises he had made the previous day, he demanded of them a written engagement to remain quietly at home, not to intermeddle with the affairs of the Lebanon, and not to circulate arms in the town. This document was immediately signed.

Tuesday, 5th June, Taher Pacha, returned from Bettedden to Der-el-Kammar; for the third time he assured the inhabitants of the good intentions of the Porte in their regard, and of its firm resolution not to allow the Druses again to attack them. Some days after a detachment of 500 soldiers arrived from Sagda to Der-el-Kammar with two howitzers from the country. He called together the officers, and in the presence of the chief men and of the troops recently arrived, he enjoined them to watch after the safety of the town, and to repulse the Druses by force if it were necessary, after which he returned to Beyrout.

The Druses nevertheless had not ceased to surround the town, preventing all communication from without, and pillaging all the provisions that were sent to the Christians.

The blockade was tightened after the departure of Taher Pacha. Three persons having left the city to gather some leaves of the grape in order to allay their hunger, were killed by the Druses. The Governor took advantage of this occasion to renew to the Christians the order not to quit the place.

This state of things continued until Wednesday, the 19th of June. The Druses then commenced to enter the town, armed and in small bands; they introduced themselves into the houses of the Christians under pretext of protecting them, whilst the governor traversed the streets accompanied by most of his officers, prevailing upon the inhabitants not to take up their arms. In the mean time the number of Druses augmented every instant, and they already filled the entire city, when the

trumpet was sounded, and all the soldiers were recalled to their barracks, of which they fastened the doors.

From that moment they never came out. Masters of Der-el-Kammar, the Druses, after having disarmed the Christians, began the pillage which continued all the night of the 19th to the 20th of June. From the morning, the Druses of the mixed districts arrived there to take part with their wives and their children, without the soldiers making the slightest effort to restrain them.

Massacre then succeeded to pillage; no one was spared; children were slaughted in their mother's lap, women and girls violated and ripped up in the sight of their husbands and fathers.

They cut down men in the streets with a blow of the hatchet, women were burnt after being bathed in the blood of their children, even the religious orders were not spared. The city was strewn with dead bodies, and the streets were weltering in blood. In the meantime about five hundred Christians had taken refuge with their families in the palace of the governor.

Excited by carnage, the Druses claimed the miserable victims, who were immediately delivered over to them. Those who had found a momentary asylum in the seraglio were driven out by the soldiers at the point of the bayonet. Two Christians who had taken refuge on the tops of the barracks were discovered by the Turks and precipitated into the streets.

At Beteddin, where a certain number of Christians had retired to beg an asylum from the soldiers the same scenes occurred; the unhappy people who had reckoned upon the promises which had been made so often and solemnly renewed, were mercilessly delivered over to the Druses, by those very persons who were commissioned to defend them. The Turkish officers of the troops Abdoul-Selim-Bey, did not even think it his duty to save the life of a poor christian servant who had been in his service for upwards of four years.

The church and the convent of Der-el-Kammar were still standing, the Druses had reserved them for the last. After having pillaged and burnt them they massacred the monks; then finding that there was nothing more to take, they set fire to the city. At least two thousand persons perished under the act of these furies.

These scenes of horror had continued during the whole of Wednesday and Thursday. The evening of that day, at half-past seven o'clock, the Governor of Beyrout, Kurchid Pacha, arrived.

There remained then at Der-el-Kammar, but one house alone untouched, that of a man named Halil Chaouyeh. That house, in which above eight hundred persons had taken refuge, could not be saved by the presence of the Mufti. On Friday at eight o'clock at night, the Druses entered it, put to death all the men and male children they found there, violated the women, and seized upon all the riches that had been carried there.

There were no more Christians at Der-el-Kammar, they were all either dead or dispersed to the mountains or towns on the sea coast. Kourchid Pacha thought that the time had arrived to announce by the firing of a gun *l'aman*, and to apprise the Druses to retire on pain of being attacked by the Sultan's troops. This order was very readily obeyed; Kourchid Pacha, after seeing the last house that was standing set fire to, quitted Der-el-Kammar, or rather the place on which stood Der-el-Kammar, not without first having a long conference with the three Druse chiefs, who had presided at the carnage, the Sheiks Sayd Bey, Djomblat, Abou-Macad-el-Kamade. *

The following account is taken from the letter of a missionary, dated from Saida, 4th June.

"During the week of Pentecost, a war that had for a long time been in contemplation between the Druses and the Christians in

* The preceding account is taken from an official paper published in the "Moniteur."

the mountains, at length broke out. The Christians were driven to desperation by the bad treatment of the Druse Chiefs, they saw that the government was powerless to do them justice for the many murders committed, of which they had been the victims. At length they rose up, and war began in the cantons that are opposite to Beyrouth. I will not here attempt to give you the description; I am too far from the seat of events, and am not sufficiently acquainted with the circumstances to do so; you shall be informed of them from Beyrout; but I will now tell you of what has occurred in the neighbourhood of Saida.

"When the country people from the canton of Seffah (*de la Pomme*) became aware of the movements that had taken place in other parts of the mountain, they began to gather round a man named Jusef-el-Mobaiedh at the village of Derb-Essin, about three-quarters of an hour's distance from Saida; there they became excited by the presence, on the bridge of the river which runs to the north of Saida, of a Druse chief, of the name of Thasem-Jusef, renowned for his cruelty. This man had with him only his Druse poignard, but he understood how to draw to his banner the Musselmans of the province of Kharroub (*du Caroubier*), on the north of Saida, by the allurement of pillage, and the hatred of the name of Christians. He very soon had a considerable number with him, of whom, the Marauders began to disturb the peaceful Christian gardeners of Saida, and even to chase them with blows of their guns. The authorities of the city remained silent.

"On Friday of the week of Pentecost, the chief Druses carried off the flocks from four Christian villages. The mob reassembled at Derb-Essin, marched upon him in following the chain of hills that coasted along the sea, at about half-an-hour's distance. The meeting very soon took place, the Christians did not distinguish themselves by their bravery; the people of the environs of Saida have a bad reputation in that respect; they are peasants, poor, fearful, and cast down by tyranny, it was with great difficulty their chief had managed to assemble them, they could not withstand the shock of the enemy; their chief

had already beaten two Druses, when finding himself abandoned by the soldiers, they took to flight, one party took the road to the mountain, the others hid themselves in the country, and some even flew for refuge towards the gate of the city to seek shelter there.

"But here was manifested the ill will and ferocity of the Mussulmen of the city; a cry of alarm resounded throughout all Saida, the women began to yell and utter imprecations against the Christians and their religion, the men now came out of the mosques; a great many of them had not even entered them, in order to be ready on the spot, it appeared to have been plotted beforehand, and that they had been engaged in the mosques to march against the Christians through zeal for their religion; they hurried to the streets armed, and those who could not get any arms seized enormous cudgels. The high part of the city, which should have been closed by order of the authorities, was open, the people threw themselves from there upon the runaways, and many inoffensive men who were coming in from the country, they surrounded them, threw them down, trampled them under foot, beat them, wounded them with knives; they discharged their fire-arms upon them, they cut many of them to pieces; the Ottoman troops of the line, who were there to preserve order, at the instigation of several of their officers, joined the Musselmen to fall upon the Christians."

After the hideous work done at Der-el-Kammar, the Druses went to the village of Betedine, and killed all the Christians who had taken refuge in the barracks there, as well as 109 persons belonging to that place and to the village of Mohasser. They then burnt Betedine, in presence of the Kaimacan and of the troops; returned to Der-el-Kammar, sacked the convent, killed the monks, and burnt the town. The massacres there had lasted the whole of Thursday, the 21st of June. The number of victims is estimated at 2,100, besides women and little girls. Scarcely a tenth of the population escaped. The names of the Druse chiefs who presided at these horrid scenes, are given in the report. It is to be hoped that neither they nor

the Turkish officers who, able to prevent, permitted and abetted these horrible crimes, will escape the punishment they have so richly earned. The report, heart-rending in its cruel details, reads like truth. We must revert to Cawnpore for a parallel to the atrocities it records.

Père Estève, superior of the missionaries in Syria, was sent in Paris, to give an account of the massacres and plunder which have taken place in Lebanon. He says that, at Damascus alone, more than 8,000 Christians have been put to death. The number of victims to Mahomedan fanaticism throughout Syria amounts to from 15,000 to 16,000. Forty nuns were saved through the exertions of Père Estève, who gave them refuge in his convent, where more than 1,500 persons were fed daily. Five nuns of the same community as the forty saved were murdered by the Druses.

The correspondent at Beirout, of the "Daily News," writing of the massacres on the 1st of June, 1860, says:—"It has been ascertained that the Druses had burnt and pillaged no fewer than 151 Christian villages since the 29th of May last, while no less than from 75,000 to 80,000 Christians of Lebanon, many of whom were a month ago wealthy men, others in quiet, easy circumstances, and all strangers to anything like poverty and want, are homeless beggars, depending on actual charity for their daily bread. Over and above the number of Christians shot in actual warfare, between 7,000 and 8,000 have been butchered—hacked to death would be the better term—in cold blood by the Druses; and besides this, more than 5,000 widows, who, until this Druse campaign, were happy wives and mothers, have lost their husbands, fathers, brothers, and all male relatives, even to the male infant at the breast, and 1,600 children are now orphans. Moreover, fifty millions sterling would not pay for the towns, villages, hamlets, and silk factories destroyed throughout the mountain —all property of Christians. There is, besides, a fearfully long list of convents, churches, and nunneries belonging to the same people, all of which have been plundered and then

destroyed by the Druses. In short, for the last twenty days it has been nothing less than a wholesale massacre of Christians by the Druses, and a wanton destruction by the latter of all property belonging to the former.

FRIGHTFUL BARBARITY OF THE DRUSES.

One poor woman—I knew both her husband and herself well at Deir-el-Kammar, where they were wealthy people—told me that when the Druses attacked the town a second time (I should mention that it had surrendered and all the inhabitants had given up their arms some twenty-four days previously to the Druses and had been promised protection by their Sheiks) her husband was hacked to pieces before her eyes with large knives by the Druses, who then declared they must kill all male children in the house. The mother tried to hide her two sons, one fifteen, the other nine years old. The Druses, however, found them out. She begged and prayed for their lives, and endeavoured to cover them in a corner with her person, but the Druses hacked at the lads over her shoulder, and gashed them till they both dropped down apparently lifeless. The Druses made off, and the woman thinking her two boys dead, remained in a sort of stupor for two hours so far as she could calculate. At last she was roused by hearing the eldest lad call her in a faint voice, trying to assure her that he was not yet dead. On this she felt the body of the young boy and found his heart beating. She got some water, and after giving it to both her children, started into the town to see whether she could procure assistance to get herself and her boys away. She got as far as the seraglio or government house, but there she found some five hundred Christians, who had taken refuge were being cut to pieces by the Druses, who had been invited to enter the precincts of the building by the Turkish soldiers of the garrison, these latter helping in the butchery, and being so far worse than the Druses, that they abused in the most infamous manner all the women. Seeing no help to be obtained here, the poor woman turned to fly,

when she came across an old Druse who had formerly been a farm servant of her husband's. After a great deal of entreaty on her part, the man consented to protect her and her children down to the sea coast, about four hours' journey, on condition of receiving an order on her brother, a wealthy man at Beyrout, for 10,000 piastres. To this she agreed, and they returned together to her house. She had not been absent more than an hour, but she found her two children cut into pieces, joint by joint, "limbs and trunk severed (to use her words), as butchers cut up sheep"—heads, legs, arms and bodies being hacked up into a shapeless mass of bloody flesh and reeking bones.

Some other poor women then joined her, and together they made their way to a mulberry plantation outside the town, where they passed the night. At daybreak they were discovered by a party of Druses, who, after stripping them to find whether they had any money on their persons, and taking away what little they possessed, told them they might go where they liked. Four of the poor creatures had babies, all under a year old. Of these infants two were girls, and two boys; the former they did not touch, but the latter, they said might grow up to be men, and bear arms against the Druses. They therefore took the poor little creatures, and before their mother's eyes tore them up the middle, and limb by limb—"exactly," to use the poor women's own expression, "as you tear up a fowl that is to be cooked with pillau." Remember, all this was done, not in the heat of fighting, but deliberately, in cold blood. And I have heard of eleven other exactly similar cases of child destruction by the Druses, in nine of which I implicitly believe, having every reason to do so.

Deir-el-Kammar contained, a month ago, a population of 8,000 souls, of whom about 4,000 were men and lads, 3,500 women and girls, and 500 children under ten years old. Of the men, not more than 150 have escaped; of the women and girls, about 2,000 have reached Beyrout; and of the young children, less than 200 are alive.

An English gentleman, however, without hesitation, promised his co-operation; and immediately placed his yacht in such a position as to enable her four small pieces of cannon to bear on the streets, and he armed his crew with muskets, swords, and pistols. He afterwards landed, examined the town, in order to see the points by which the Druses could enter; he then caused the women, children, and the more valuable portion of the property, to be placed in safety; and had certain points occupied by his men, taking other measures of defence. All this gave confidence to the peaceable part of the population, and overawed that which was suspected of connivance with the Druses. The latter were told by their spies that an English vessel of war was in port, that English troops had been landed; and they, in consequence, abandoned their projected attack on the town, and went away."

The 4th of July, 1860. One of the French missionaries in Syria, the Reverend Père Rousseau, addressed a letter (published in the "Union Franche-Comptoise) from Saida, giving an account of the massacres of the month of June, 1860, which he had either witnessed, or had an immediate knowledge of from his fellow labourers in the different localities that were the scenes of carnage and spoliation.

"In my last letter (says the writer), I gave you an account of the events which took place at Deir-el-Kamar—

"This city was then besieged by the Druses. Now it is without inhabitants, all the Christians who inhabited it have been massacred, with the exception of the small number of fugitives who had the good fortune to escape."

This communication is not only so graphic, but by all persons cognizant of the affairs spoken of, and acquainted with the writer, so well known to be an authentic and accurate narration, that it seems best to me the statement should be given in the writer's own words :—

"Si on excepte le Kesrouan, c'est-à-dire la partie du Liban comprise entre Beyrouth et Tripoli, partout ailleurs les chrétiens ont subi la mort ou les atrocités les plus révoltantes. Toutes

les habitations ont été pillées, brûlées et détruites par les Druses. Ces ennemis du nom chrétien se dirigent actuellement et se concentrent vers le Kesrouan.

" Le fait que je vais vous signaler vous donnera l'idée de la justice et de la protection que le gouvernement Turc accorde dans ce pays-ci aux chrétiens, et de la bonne foi qu'il apporte dans ses relations avec eux.

" Les Druses ont attaqué plusieurs fois Der-Kamar, mais ils avaient été vigoureusement repoussés par les chrétiens, et ils n'avaient plus reparu. Sur ces entrefaits, arriva à Der Kamar Taer-Pacha, général de division Turc. Il proposa un arrangement aux chrétiens, leur persuada de déposer les armes, prenant l'engagement de les défendre contre les Druses s'ils étaient attaqués. Les chrétiens consentirent à cette proposition. Un acte public fut rédigé et signé par les principaux de la ville et par le général lui-même. Peu de jours après, Taer-Pacha annonça qu'il allait retourner à Beyrouth. Les chrétiens manifestèrent leur craintes d'être ainsi livrés à la discrétion des Druses par cette absence; mais le général les reassura en leur disant que quiconque les attaquerait, attaquerait le gouvernement Turc même; qu'il avait donné des ordre formels au commandant de la garnison de la ville pour les défendre à outrance s'ils étaient attaqués.

" Le général retourna à Beyrouth, et de cette ville il leur écrivit pour réitérer ses engagements.

" Les chrétiens reçurent sa lettre, et deux heures aprés les Druses entraient par petites bandes dans Der-Kamar. Le soir la ville en était remplie. Alors commença le pillage, et il dura toute la nuit.

" Les principaux habitants de la ville, au nombre de six cents, se rendirent chez le gouverneur pour le prier de faire cesser le pillage et d'obliger les Druses à quitter la ville d'après les conventions arrêtées avec le général.

" Le gouverneur répondit qu'il n'avait point de pouvoir, mais que s'ils voulaient lui donner cent cinquante mille piastres, il les garderait chez lui et leur sauverait la vie. Les cent

cinquante mille piastres furent comptées. Dès que le gouverneur les eut reçues, il leur représenta que cette somme n'était point suffisante, qu'ils étaient riches et qu'il était en droit d'exiger d'eux quatre cent mille piastres. Les chrétiens lui firent observer que leurs maisons avaient été pillées, qu'ils n'avaient plus d'argent, mais qu'ils allaient lui faire un billet, qu'ils signeraient tous, portant obligation de cette somme.

"Après que les Druses eurent passé le premier jour et la nuit suivante à piller, ils passèrent une autre journée à massacrer les hommes et les enfants mâles. Les femmes et les filles furent réservées et soumises ensuite à tous leurs outrages. Quarante femmes ont été massacrées à Der-Kamar.

"Après le massacre des chrétiens de la ville, les Druses se sont portés au palais du gouverneur pour immoler les chrétiens qui s'y étaient réfugiés.

"Le gouverneur, malgré ses engagements, malgré les cent cinquante mille piastres qu'il avait reçues, malgré le billet de quatre cent mille piastres souscrit par les six cents principaux habitants de Der-Kamar, livra immédiatement ceux dont il avait garanti la vie.

"Les Druses commencèrent par leur arracher tous les vêtements. Lorsqu'ils eurent été mis dans une nudité complète, les Druses les massacrèrent à coups de poignard et de yatagans. Personne n'échappa. Un ruisseau de sang coulait du palais du gouverneur.

"Les filles et les femmes chrétiennes ont été déshonorées sous les yeux du gouverneur par les soldats du gouvernement; les soldats ont eu leur part partout. Ils ont combattu les chrétiens avec les Druses, ils ont pillé et massacré les chrétiens avec les Druses, ils ont déshonoré les femmes et les filles des chrétiens avec les Druses. On assure qu'aucune femme n'a échappé aux brutalités des soldats Turcs et des Druses.

"Après ces scènes de violence et d'horreur contre les femmes chrétiennes, les soldats Turcs et les Druses ont achevé le pillage; ils ont emporté le butin et mis le feu à la ville.

Der-Kamar, qui était une des villes les plus élégantes de Syrie, n'est plus maintenant qu'un monceau de ruines.

" Les nouvelles de l'entrée des Druses à Der-Kamar sont parvenues à Beyrouth pendant la première nuit, lorsque les Druses étaient encore occupés au pillage. Tous les consuls généraux se sont rendus en corps auprès de Kurchid Pacha, gouverneur général du pachalik de Saïda, pour le prier de se rendre à Der-Kamar afin d'empêcher le massacre des chrétiens. Le pacha partit immédiatement. Il pouvait et devait arriver à Der-Kamar en cinq heures. Il n'y a pas plus de distance de Beyrouth à cette ville. Il a mis vingt-cinq heures pour faire ce chemin.

" Au lieu de se rendre directement à Der-Kamar, le pacha a passé tout la journée pendant laquelle le massacre des chrétiens a eu lieu dans la maison du chef Druse qui avait ordonné le pillage et les scénes de carnage qui s'accomplissaient dans la malheureuse ville Der-Kamar. Lorsqu'il est arrivé, il ne restait plus que quarante chrétiens qui n'étaient pas massacrés. Il les a délivrés.

" Nous avions trois écoles à Der-Kamar. Deux de nos maîtres et un frère ont été tués. Notre maison, sur laquelle flottait, par ordre du consul-général, le drapeau de la France, n'a pas été respectée. Heureusement les Péres qui s'y trouvaient en residence étaient partis avant la derniére catastrophe.

" Il y a eu à Der-Kamar trois mille hommes de massacrés et quarante femmes, tant dans la ville que dans le palais du gouverneur. Six cents hommes ont réussi à se sauver.

" Chaque jour il nous arrive des centaines de femmes et d'enfants, qui viennent encore augmenter le nombre des malheureux â Saïda. On a été obligé d'en éxpédier sur d'autres points de la Syrie. Depuis plusieurs jours on en a transporté sur des barques et sur des batiments français et anglais du côté du Kesrouan entre Beyrouth et Tripoli, où se trouve, comme je vous l'ai dit, une nombreuse population de chrétiens.

" La ville de Zahlé comptait de douze à quinze mille habi-

tants, tous chrètiens. Les Druses avaient été repousées deux fois avec perte par les chrétiens de cette ville; mais une troisième fois, ils ont, dit-on, employé un stratagème qui leur a réussi. Les Druses savaient que les chrétiens de Zahlé attendaient un renfort: ils ont fabriqué des bannières et des croix qu'ils ont placées en tête d'une troupe de deux mille hommes. Les Druses s'ètaient déguisés. En arrivant près de Zahlé ils chantaient des chansons patriotiques en usage chez les chrétiens. Des habitants de Zahlé, trompés par cette ruse, sont venus sans défiance au devant de ces faux frères, qui les ont reçus à coups de fusil et qui, sans perdre de temps, sont tombés sur eux à coup de sabre et ont fait une grande boucherie.

" Malgré cette surprise, un grand nombre ont pu prendre la fuite. Déjà les femmes et les enfants s'étaient retirés dans les montagnes depuis quelques jours, en sorte que le massacre à Zahlé n'a pas été aussi grand que dans les autres villes; mais il a été bien douloureux pour nous, et surtout pour moi, par la perte que nous avons faite du P. Billotet, Franchecomtois comme moi. Le P. Billotet a été tué au moment où il prenait le Saint-Sacrement pour l'emporter ou le consommer. Trois frères ont été tués près de lui, et un grand nombre d'autres personnes qui s'ètaient réfugiées dans notre maison, croyant y trouver un asile sûr à l'ombre du drapeau de la France.

" Vingt et une religieuses auraient été déshonorées par les soldats Turcs et par les Druses dans la maison où elles s'étaient réfugiées. Je ne puis encore néanmoins garantir absolument la certitude de ce fait comme je garantis la vérité des autres.

" Deux de ces religieuses ont été tuées. Mais le fait qui a le plus effrayé les habitants de Zahlé et les a obligés à prendre la fuite, c'est d'avoir vu les soldats du gouvernement Turc tirer à coups de canon contre la ville, qui a été réduite en cendres.

" Racïa et Jadaïdi, villes situées dans l'Anti-Liban, viennent de subir le même sort par la trahison et la mauvaise foi de leurs gouverneurs.

"Un grand nombre de chrétiens, après la destruction des villes et villages qu'ils habitaient, avaient cherché un asile dans des cavernes et dans le fond des montagnes où se trouvent de petis bois. Les Druses, pour que personne des chrétiens n'échappe à leur fureur, ont parcouru les montagnes avec de gros chiens pour découvrir les chrétiens cachés. Ils en ont découvert une centaine en un seul endroit. Ils leur ont lié les mains derrière le dos pour les mettre à mort avec plus de cruauté. A quelques-uns ils abattaient un bras, à d'autres ils coupaient les mains, à plusieur sils enlevaient des morceaux de chair, ils leur crevaient les yeux ou les brûlaient vivants.

"Beyrouth, malgré la présence des consuls généraux et de plus de vingt bâtiments de guerre qui stationnent dans le port, n'est ni sûr ni tranquille. Les Turcs ont été sur le point de se soulever. A la moindre alerte, les chrétiens seraint massacrés. Ils le savent; aussi un grand nombre sont partis pour Alexandrie et pour Marseille.

"A Saïda, à cause des mêmes craintes, craintes tout aussi fondées, les principales familles se sont expatriées. Dans cette ville, tout était prêt pour le massacre et pour le pillage. Le jour et la nuit étaient désignés. Le gouverneur Turc et le mufti étaient sur le point de donner le signal, lorsque l'amiral qui stationne à Beyrouth a été averti du danger qui nous menaçait. Il nous a envoyé en tout hâte un des bâtiments qu'il a sous ses ordres."

A letter from Mr. Cyril Graham to Lord Dufferin gives a connected narrative of the late massacres. Lord John Russell is told by Lord Dufferin:—Your Lordship may rely with implicit confidence upon the accuracy of all Mr. Graham's statements of facts, as his knowledge of Arabic and his personal acquaintance both with the Druse and the Maronite populations, combined with the opportunities he has had of visiting the places where these tragedies have occurred, will have given him peculiar facilities for arriving at the truth."

"MR. GRAHAM TO LORD DUFFERIN.

"Beyrout, July 18.

"Although many and various accounts have no doubt appeared in the public press of the horrors which have been committed within the last two months in Syria, and I have sent you, from the beginning, constant reports of the progress of this 'war,' yet it will no doubt be interesting to you, and to English people in general, to have a connected sketch of the whole of this sad affair, from the commencement of hostilities up to the present moment. Having been in the country during the whole of the war, and having seen, perhaps, more of its horrors than any other European, and, moreover, having had no other employment than that of seeking after accurate information with regard to affairs, I may feel some confidence in the accuracy of the account I send you; and harassing and painful as the details will appear, nevertheless they are but too true. It is to be remembered that in the summer of last year a skirmish took place at the village of Beit Meri, two hours and a-half from Beyrout, one Sunday afternoon. Several persons were killed on both sides, but happily the affair had no further consequences at that time. However, the bad feeling which had subsisted previously to that time between the Maronites and the Druses, was in nowise improved by two parties of them having fought it out; and although a perfect reconciliation was proclaimed, yet it was generally feared that in the present year, 1860, hostilities would be renewed, unless the Government took measures to prevent bloodshed. The Druses were the first aggressors, for early in May a monk was found murdered in a convent, halfway between Beyrout and Deir-el-Kammar; and, although the actual murderers were never identified, there was not the slightest doubt that they were Druses, for no Christian would ever dare to touch a priest. The Christians then retaliated, and killed the first Druse they found. Then two Christians were killed by the Druses by the Damoor

river, between this and Sidon, and their relatives in return killed two Druses, according to the law of blood feud among all those nations. At this time, had the Government used the slightest exertions, they might have prevented this feud then spreading. I was with Said Bek Jumblad, the great chief of the Druses at Moktarah, not far from Bleddin, the old palace of the Emir Beshir, when things had arrived at this stage, and I urged him to do all in his power to stop further bloodshed.

"On the 28th of May the war broke out in all its fury. In the evening of that day thirty-two villages were seen burning from Beyrout, and some of the most flourishing places in the Lebanon, on the morning of the 29th, were uninhabited and in ruins. The Druses even advanced to within forty minutes' march of Beyrout, and, in the face of the Pacha and all his camp (for he had pretended to go out with his army in order to stop the war), burnt, and plundered, and slaughtered people in the rich village of Hadad, the residence of a house of the Emirs. In this instance it is said—and there is every reason to believe the report to be true—that the Turkish soldiers fired upon the flying Christians. On the 29th of May also, Hasbeya, a large town under Mount Hermon, was first attacked by the Druses: a Moslem Emir of the family of the Shehab lived there, who had for a long time been a great annoyance to the Pachas of Damascus, his authority being very great there. Last year, Ahmed Pacha, Governor of Damascus, sent a detachment of troops to occupy the towns under Hermon, and he had lately sent a strong reinforcement, under the command of Othman Bek, whose name will ever be mentioned with abhorrence by Christians. This man, on the day of the attack on Hasbeya, told the Christians that he had been sent to protect them from the Druses, but that they must lay down their arms, otherwise they would incur the displeasure of the Government. They accordingly obeyed, believing that he would keep his word. For 'greater security' he invited them all into the Serai Palace, used as a barrack, and the men, with the women and children, crowded into this building. The

arms they had delivered up were then put on the backs of mules, and sent off with an escort, professedly to Damascus, but with so small a one that it would be mockery to call it an escort. Before the mules were well out of the valley of Hasbeya, the Druses, as had been intended, fell upon them; the soldiers made no resistance, and all the arms fell into the hands of the Druses.

"The Christians, meanwhile, penned up in the Serai, with hardly any food and water, were now in a state of great suffering. On the 5th of June they began to feel great alarm, for they saw the harem of the Governor preparing to depart. To the questions of the Christians as to the cause of this movement, only evasive answers were given. On the 6th, many of the soldiers were seen leaving; then the unfortunate people, when it was too late, saw clearly how treacherously they had been deceived. They rushed into the outer court and entreated to be let out. The signal was then given, the gates thrown open, and in rushed the Druses, armed with any weapon they could seize, and then commenced an indiscriminate slaughter of all the males. Some, indeed, made their way through the door to the outer gate, only to be seized by the Turkish soldiery; nor were these passive only in the transaction. Many Christians whom I have examined, have sworn to me that they saw the soldiers themselves taking part in the slaughter, and the subsequent behaviour of these brutal troops to the women, was savage in the extreme. From the wounds I have seen, both on the living and the dead, it would appear that they went to work with the most systematic cruelty; 10, 12, and 14 deep cuts on the body of one person are not unfrequent; some of the wounds show that they were made with blunt instruments. In short, everything was used which came to hand, and, according to the nature of the weapon, hands and limbs were cut off, or brains dashed out, or bodies mangled. Of all the men in the Serai, some 40 or 50 only escaped; many of these had been severely wounded and left for dead, while some few hid themselves among the dead bodies and made their escape by night. Some

of these reached Beyrout, their clothes literally saturated with blood from the bodies under which they had lain. Women the Druses did not slaughter, nor, for the most part, I believe, ill-use; that was left for Turks and Moslems to do, and they did it. Little boys of four and five years old were not safe; these would be seized from the mother and dashed on the ground, or torn to pieces before her face; or, if her grasp was too tight, they would kill it on her lap; and, in some cases, to save further trouble, mother and child were cut down together. Many women have assured me that the Turkish soldiers have taken their children, one leg in each hand, and torn them in two. So when the sun set on the 6th of June, scarcely a male was left of the large and prosperous population under Hermon; for on that same day, and nearly under similar circumstances, the Christians of Rasheya were massacred.

"The Emir Shehab, whom I have before mentioned, and almost all his house, were killed, and they Moslems. In no other instance had the Druses dared even to touch the poorest Moslems; but these men—men of rank and standing—were enemies of the Pasha of Damascus personally, and so they were sacrificed—not, it will be believed, without the deputy of the Pacha having beforehand signified his approbation. If we had no other evidence than this, we should have enough to prove to us how guilty the officers of the Porte have been. While the unfortunate creatures who had taken refuge in the Serai at Hasbeya were suffering from hunger and thirst, the people of Sidon, who for some days previously had been in a state of constant alarm, were attacked on the 1st of June by the Bashi-Bazouks and other Moslems. For several days the slaughter continued. No Christian outside the town was in safety. If a man or a male child, he was cut down; if a woman, she was sure to be brutally ill-used. This encouraged the Druses greatly, who said, 'After all, the Moslems understand the work best.' The Druses then broke into, and destroyed the monastery above Sidon, killing 16 monks, and yet the Governor of Sidon did not even attempt to interfere, although, Sidon being a walled

town, he had only to close the gates and prevent any armed Druse from entering. The Bashi-Bazouks escaped also with impunity. I should have mentioned before, that a great number of refugees from the villages in the mountains, which had been burnt in the first attack of the 28th of May, who were escaping to Beyrout, and were, indeed, within three hours' walk of their goal, were fallen upon by the Druses or irregular troops, and cut to pieces. This happened on the 30th or 31st of May.

"On the 3rd of June, the first great attack was made on Dier-el-Kammar, the ancient capital of the Lebanon, containing a population of about 7,000. The very morning of that day the American missionary, Mr. Bird, had been entreated by the natives of two of the neighbouring villages to go to their relief and bring them to Deir-el-Kammar, where they believed they would be in greater security. He immediately called on the Mustsellin, commander of the troops, and asked for an escort, which, with some difficulty, was given to him. He had not been gone above an hour and a half before the Druses suddenly came down upon the town, crying their war-cry. A tremendous fire was kept up till night; many of the Christians were killed, and on this occasion, it is said, from 70 to 80 Druses, for the Christians defended themselves well. On the following day, however, when the Druses again appeared (they had retired after it became dark), the Christians wished to solicit peace, and Mr. Bird, who early in the morning of the 4th had succeeded in re-entering the town, went to the Druse chiefs as the envoy of the people. Peace, indeed, was granted, but the Druses made their own terms. They immediately entered the town and for three days continuously, were plundering and carrying off everything they could move; while, within a stone's throw of the town, no Christian was safe, and many wanton murders were committed. One poor old man who could scarcely crawl so far, had led his cow to the ——— for green pasture, and two Druses immediately pounced upon him and cut him down. Why the rest of the inhabitants at that moment were spared at all, I know not.

"The next great scheme was to surprise and take Rahleh. The usual population of this place is about ten thousand; but at that moment (early in June) there were said to be double that number, so many of the inhabitants of the villages round about having sought refuge there. At the first report of the successes of the Druses, a large body of their brethren came up from the Hauran, under the command of the warlike and savage chief, Ismail-el-Atrash. These fellows came up simply from a wish for plunder, and brought with them numbers of Arabs of the small nomadic tribes who encamped about the Hauran. They all marched up the Bokaa, as the great plain of Cœlesyria, between the chains of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon is called, and halted near the ravine which leads up to Zahleh. There they were joined by all kinds of rabble—Kurds from Damascus and Homs, and Metawalis from Baalbek, all joining with the hope of plunder and of butchering the christians.

"The moment the news of this movement reached Beyrout, the Consuls-General of the five great powers did all in their power to prevent further bloodshed. They went to the Pacha, asked him if he was going to do anything, protested loudly against his inactivity—for he had never moved since the first outbreak, when he pitched his encampment half an hour from the town—and insisted on his doing something to keep off the danger impending on Zahleh. He said, 'Well, I will send some troops to protect the place.' He did so; but this was only the signal for its destruction. No sooner did the Druses on this side of the Lebanon, who, since the affair of Deir-el-Kammar, had been comparatively idle, see the movement of the Turkish troops, than they raised their war cry, and headed by one of their principal Shieks (who has the rank of Bek in the Turkish service) rushed onwards to Zahleh. From the eastern-most ridge of the Lebanon, several deep ravines run into the plain of Cœlesyria; in one of these, and half-way down it, Zahleh is situated. It was the largest and most rising town in all the Lebanon, the chief station of the French Lazarists, and

contained public buildings, a very handsome cathedral and schools, and very good houses. The people of Zahleh had already sent to the Druses in the Bokaa to ask for peace, but the conditions were so humiliating, so utterly preposterous, that they could not possibly accept them. Their very nature showed at once that they did not originate with the Druses, but with the Moslems of Damascus. On the 19th of June, the Ottoman troops and the Druses of the Lebanon appeared above Zahleh, which was no sooner perceived by those in the Bokaa than a simultaneous movement took place towards the town. The Christians evacuated it at once, climbed up the steep mountain side, and expected to get round the Lebanon Druses, and then fall upon them in the ravine. They were much too slow; before they had well reached the summit of the mountain, they saw that the two forces had met, and were beginning to burn the town from either end. After firing some volleys, they took to flight, as they saw that in addition to all, the Turkish troops had turned against them; only the aged, infirm, and some women and children were left in the town—they were slaughtered. Two of the French Lazarists were killed and another wounded. Europeans were no longer safe. In the attack on Zahleh, the troops under the command of one Mûribek took a more open part than they had done before; they even made use of a fieldpiece that they had brought with them to fire upon the town, and one shot from this is said to have brought down the bell of the cathedral. So much for Kurschid Pacha's promises.

"The Druses, now elated with success and plunder, turned again upon Deir-el-Kammar; the wretched people hearing of their approach prepared to make the best of the fight, but the Governor, who had 500 troops in the Serai, while at Bleddin, half a mile off, there were three hundred more, told them they had nothing to fear if they would give him up their arms, and he insisted on their doing so. They applied for an escort to come to Beyrout. This he would in nowise permit, so they could only do as they were bid. Their valuables he made them

place in the Serai, and then ordered a great part of the population there. So men, women, and children were all crowded together in the Serai under his protection on the night of the 20th. On the morning of the 21st of June, the Druses collected round the town. One of their leaders came to the Serai, and desired to speak to the Governor. A conversation was carried on in a low voice by means of an interpreter (for the Turk did not know Arabic); at last a question was asked, to which they heard the Governor give the answer, "Hepsi" ("Ab," in Turkish). Thereupon the Druse disappeared, but in a few moments the gate was thrown open, and in rushed the fiends, cutting down and slaughtering every male, the soldiers co-operating. In short, a second tragedy like that at Hasbeya was enacted, only in this case the slaughter was more dreadful. Those who had not entered the Serai fared no better; all were to be killed, and those who had crossed the stream and reached Bleddin in safety, were shot down by the troops quartered there. Those who had escaped had managed to hide themselves in drains, and some of the wounded crawled away. I have had a vivid description of the whole scene from some dozens of women who were there. They have told me how, before their very face, they have seen husband, father, brothers, and children, cut to pieces; how in trying to save the life of a child they have been knocked down, and the child torn from them and cut to pieces, and the pieces thrown in their face; how they have been insulted by the Turkish soldiery; and how in their way down to the sea the Druses had robbed them of everything they possessed. And it must be remembered that there were people at Deir-el-Kammar who were very wealthy and lived in well-built and comfortable houses, people who had been well-educated and used to luxury, and now have to beg their bread. The number of killed in this horrible massacre, has been variously estimated; some say that 900, some that 1,800 persons were killed. I have good reason to believe, after a careful comparison of all the accounts, that from 1,100 to 1,200 males actually perished in that one day. The Druses

then set fire to the town; the smoke came over Beyrout as a column of cloud, and warned us of the calamity. I myself can testify that the accounts are not much exaggerated: I travelled over most of the open country before the war was over, and came to Deir-el-Kammar a few days after the massacre. Almost every house was burnt, and the streets crowded with dead bodies, most of them stripped and mutilated in every possible way. My road led through the town, and through some of the streets my horse could not even pass, for the bodies were literally piled up. Most of those I examined had many wounds, and in each case was the right hand either entirely or nearly cut off; the poor wretch, in default of weapons, having instinctively raised his arm to parry the blow aimed at him. I saw little children, of not more than three or four years old, stretched on the ground, and old men with grey beards. In some places you could see the expression of agony; in others, of last despair. One poor creature, on his knees, had been cut down as he appealed to the mercy of his murderers. I saw bodies without heads, and heads lying alone about the place—all lying unburied, to be devoured by the hyænas and wild beasts. While in the midst of this scene of death—a scene which would have forced any one, I should have supposed, to be sober—some Druses, who had came to carry off what remaining bits of timber there might be in the houses, were laughing and joking at the appearance of the victims. I expressed my horror of such brutal behaviour to the great Chief of the Druses, and urged him to have the dead buried. He laughed, and asked me why. I have some hopes that this has been done, as he promised to give an order for it, although he said it would be difficult to induce the Druses to bury Christian carcases.

"When the account reached Beyrout the horror and indignation were indescribable. Used as we had become to such horrors, yet this surpassed all, and revealed a degree of treachery on the part of the Pasha which it would be almost impossible to persuade a sober European statesmen could be

practised by an official in the high position of a governor of a great province. The Pasha reached Deir-el-Kammar the day after the slaughter; a fact, 'which he will ever lament and deplore as long as he lives;' that is what he says, so, of course it is true. The details had barely reached us when, on Sunday afternoon, the 26th June, the French brig-of-war *Sentinelle*, brought us alarming reports from Sidon. The Druses were again threatening the place, and the Mufti had been preaching in the mosque, and even in the streets, 'Death to the Christians!' and calling upon the faithful to behold how the cause of the righteous triumphed. 'Now is the time,' he was heard to proclaim, 'God has given the infidel into our hands.' On the preceding night, Sept. 25, armed Druses had been allowed to sleep in the town, and Moslems, with weapons of different kinds, had passed the night in the mosque, ready at any moment, should the Druse begin the carnage, to aid them to the best of their power. And on the following night it was believed the slaughter would take place. Two English and two French men-of-war immediately steamed off, and anchored at Sidon before sunset, and this intimidated the fanatics, and, in all probability, prevented an outbreak. It was found on inquiry that a trap had indeed been laid here also, for the Governor of Sidon had disarmed all the Christians, on the plea that in the then disturbed state of the country it was deemed necessary for people to be disarmed, while, at the same time, he permitted the Druses and Moslems to enter and remain in the town without taking from them any of their arms. Nothing could be more unjust than this; nothing could more clearly show the bad end he had in view. On being officially asked if it was true, he did not deny it, but said that in future he would have all parties to give up their arms: but on being desired to give this promise in writing, he refused, saying that after all it was not in his power to prevent the Druses bringing their arms into Sidon, although he had a garrison of three hundred troops there, and cannon, and he was in a walled town.

"After the butchery of Deir-el-Kammar, and while the panic was going on at Sidon, Beyrout itself was menaced, and, but for the presence of several European men-of-war, this place would have shared the fate of other towns. Almost all the native merchants have escaped to Alexandria; and to improve matters, a Moslem was found murdered. This created a great sensation; the Moslems insisted on the execution of a Christian, and some poor fellow was seized, tried, and executed in a very few hours, who had probably as much to do with the murder, as the Emperor of China. The Consuls General could now no longer have any confidence in the Pasha, and they determined to send a joint letter to the great chief of the Druses themselves, demanding that they should cease from further hostilities. Murders were daily going on, Beyrout and Sidon were in danger, and thousands of persons who had congregated in the Kesrouan (as the district north of the Dog River is called) were in hourly expectation of an attack. The Druse chiefs clearly showed that they had not been the chief agents in the mountain war. They had sold themselves to the pashas, and they evaded giving any direct answer.

"But this attempt on the part of Consuls General of the Five Powers was successful for the moment. The pasha heard of the letter; he saw that he had been detected, and then his only hope was to insist on peace. We have since found, as, indeed, we suspected only too well at the time, that a repetition of the massacres of Hasbeya and Deir-el-Kammar had been projected in the Kesrouan. The Druses were to have marched to the borders of this district, the Pasha was to have sent a large force of Ottoman troops "to preserve order and to protect the Christians from the Druses," and then the carnage would have begun, and probably never would have ended until the Druses and Moslems had slaughtered the greater part of the Christian population in Lebanon. Thousands must have perished had this infamous policy been carried out. The result, then, has been the official declaration of peace in Lebanon

on one condition only; that the Christians are to look upon bygones as bygones. The Pasha went through the farce of summoning an equal number of representatives from both races, but those who came on the part of the Christians were traitors who had been bribed; nor, indeed, had they been altogether honest men, would they have dared to do otherwise than the Pasha chose to dictate. Poor, wretched people! 'Bygones to be bygones!' How many thousands are ruined and destitute; how many women are altogether unprotected, and their homes and goods gone! Sixty towns and villages in Lebanon are burnt, and this goodly mountain has become a black desert.

"It is said that 75,000 persons are destitute. This seems a great number; but some idea may be formed of the depopulation when I state that the English man-of-war alone brought to Beyrout, from Sidon and the Damur river, 2,400 refugees, about 2,110 of whom were women and female children. Most of the boys who had reached this had escaped in women's clothes. All wish to leave the country. The poor people are panic stricken, and if they could get away scarcely any of the Christians wonld remain an hour longer under the Turkish rule. But here again has been another atrocious tyranny and premeditated extinction of the Christian race. These poor creatures, who have been for some time wishing to leave Damascus and other towns for fear of their lives, have been prevented by the Pashas, who will not give them a *tesheré* (pass), although they have not the slightest right to withhold it, for any subject may travel about the Ottoman dominions at pleasure.

"It is difficult to say how many Christians have been killed in all the mountain massacres. The numbers are rated very differently, some rating the number of deaths at 4,000, others at as many as 10,000. This last number is a very great exaggeration, and I should place the maximum at 4,000; for from the best information I have been able to collect from many sources, I rate the number of killed at Deir-el-Kammar at 1,100 or 1,200; at Hasbeya and Rasheya, 700; at Sidon, 550;

so that in the three great massacres from 2,250 to 2,350 males fell. Above 200 refugees were cut to pieces on the 30th and 31st of May, near Beyrout, and if 1,000 more Christians were killed in the villages I should say that was quite the outside; so that I should not be inclined to think that more than 3,500 have actually perished—but 3,500 males; and that takes a great deal out of a population whose whole wealth and prosperity depends on its energy.

"On Wednesday, the 11th of July, a Turkish line-of-battle ship and two frigates entered the bay, having on board about 3,000 troops. This caused a fresh panic, and all those who had lingered here now made their preparations to depart, for the Consuls insisted on the Pacha permiting those who wished to leave to embark. The Christians of Beyrout felt now that it was all over with them. Hitherto they had looked with comfort to the foreign men-of-war at anchor in the bay; now they feel they are between two fires, and this great additional military force being landed, instead of giving security, adds only to the insolence of the Moslems, and, consequently, to the danger of the Christians.

"So far goes my sketch of the war in Lebanon. This war (it is farce using the term when the whole has been a butchery) has now been concluded; and would that my relation of horrors could conclude with it! Almost the very day on which peace was proclaimed a fanatical outbreak broke out at Damascus. We had been expecting it. Indeed, all those best acquainted with Syria, have for three or four years foreseen that some dreadful tragedy would be enacted in this country, especially in the capital. In no place is the fanaticism stronger than at Damascus, and the Christians are in such a minority that the very thought of a general slaughter is too dreadful. The Moslems number about 130,000, and the Christians not more than 15,000. The train, which had been long laid, was fired on Monday, the 9th of July, at two o'clock p.m. The house of the Russian Consul was the first to be attacked, then some of the houses of the leading Christian merchants, each,

according to the abominable custom of this country, being set on fire. This work was found to be too slow for them, so they went off to the Aleppo-gate (Bab Tûma), and commenced burning the whole Christian quarter systematically. I am not going to enter into further details, as the affair of Damascus is not yet over; but up to the moment the last despatch went, which was eight days after the commencement of the affair, the Christian quarter was still burning, the cry of the Moslem still raging, and the thirst for blood not yet satiated. No one is safe. The streets are crowded by fanatics who continually shout 'Death to the Christians! Come, let us slaughter the Christians; let not one remain.' The Europeans, up to the time of the last despatch, had escaped, no thanks to the people, for they have burnt all the Consulates except the British and Russian, and call loudly that the Russian and French Consuls be delivered up to them. The very few Europeans at Damascus have found refuge with Abdel-Kader or with Mr. Brent, her Britannic Majesty's Consul, who by his firm and splendid behaviour has been the means, up to the present, of saving many lives. But he is regularly besieged with some 100 refugees in his house, and any moment may be his last. To add to these horrors, the Arabs and Kurds have come into the city, and besides plundering and murdering the men, they carry off the women. And the Pacha has done nothing. Ahmed Pacha never ordered the gates to be closed; and the Ottoman troops have distinguished themselves by their eagerness to slaughter the Christians and illtreat the women. Otman Beg, the same who was at Hasbeya, entered Damascus a few days ago, and received the honours of a conquering hero. Nothing can be more infamous than the behaviour of Ahmed Pacha and of all the officials. We all tremble for Aleppo, Homs, Hama, even for Jerusalem. May these places escape! I fear not. At all events Aleppo will hardly remain quiet."

Account of the commencement of the Damascus massacre, by M. Wetzlern:

"Damascus, 10th July, 4 p.m.—I hasten to inform you, by

express, that yesterday, at two o'clock p.m., a circumstance, in itself of little importance, but which was probably not accidental, led to the sacking of all the Christian quarters. Two hours later, fire was added to pillage, and both continue down to the present moment; but as the last streets of the quarter are now burning, the destruction will soon be complete. The four principal asylums of the Christian population in this calamity are the Consulates of Prussia, England, the palace of Abd-el-Kader, and the citadel. The Consulates of France, Russia, Austria, Belgium, Holland, and the United States of America, have all been burned. Thanks to the good sense of the inhabitants of Damascus, the number of plunderers did not exceed 500 yesterday; during the night it increased to 1,200; and this day at noon, including the Bedouin and Druse peasants, who kill without pillaging, there are 2,400 in all. But the government had here, as elsewhere, decided on the destruction of the Christian quarter, for the 5,000 soldiers, or thereabouts, both regular and irregular, who, without even employing force, might have prevented the whole affair, surrounded the Christian quarter; and while they allowed the pillagers to pass freely, massacred the Christians or drove them back into the flames. Nevertheless, owing to the kindness of a great number of the citizens (Mahometan), the majority of the Christian community, which amounted to about 25,000 souls, have been saved. Hundreds of Mussulman families have sheltered the fugitives in their houses.

"D. WETZLERN."

Another letter from Beyrout, dated the 15th July, gives further details:—

"Damascus, is the real capital of Syria, and is the largest city of Asiatic Turkey. It is considered by all Moslems a holy town, as from it departs, and to it arrives every year the haj, or pilgrim caravan, to and from Mecca. The population of Damascus exceeds 150,000, of which 130,000 are Moslems, 15,000 Christians, and 6,000 Jews. Ever since the murder of

the Christians by the Druses in Lebanon commenced, and more particularly since it became every day more and more evident to all men that the Turkish government showed partiality to the Druses, the more disreputable Moslems of Damascus have been exceedingly insolent to the Christians. These low Moslems are a numerous, a very troublesome, and an exceedingly bigoted race in all large Oriental towns, and are tenfold more so in Damascus than any place I know in Asia. Hearing how the Government had everywhere not only sided against their co-religionists, but how it had everywhere in Lebanon actually helped to betray, if not really to murder them, the Christians of Damascus were from the very outset disheartened and frightened, as well they might be, when threatened from day to day that the Moslems would rise and exterminate them. Matters got worse and worse, the one party becoming daily more frightened, the other hourly more insolent, until at last, on Sunday, the 8th inst., when the Christians came out of their various churches, a mob of Moslem lads were busy in the streets making crosses in chalk on the ground, and then stamping and spitting on the sacred emblem. But so utterly downhearted were the Christians, that they did not even complain to the authorities of this wanton insult. On the contrary, all they did was to confine themselves still more strictly within their houses for the rest of the day. What must, then, have been their astonishment on the Monday morning to see these same lads who had made and spat upon the crosses on the previous day, sweeping the streets of the Christian quarter in chains by order of the Turkish head of police. They at once supposed that this order must have been given for the very purpose of exciting a riot, and they were not mistaken. At two p.m., some 300 of the lowest Moslems of Damascus rushed armed into the Christian quarter, crying out, ‘ Slay the dogs of Christians ! and immediately the work of plunder, burning, and murder commenced. Achmet Pacha, Governor General and Commander-in-Chief of the place—Field-Marshal in the Sultan’s army—was at once informed of what had taken place.

But although he had at his disposal some eight hundred regular troops and several field pieces, not a gun nor a man did he move. He never showed himself in the streets, nor took any steps whatever to stop the massacre, declaring—the old story of Hasbeya, Rasheya, Deir-el-Kammar, and Sidon—that he had not troops enough to do any good. The Russian Consulate was almost the first house attacked, and all those Christians who did not take refuge with the famous Algerine Chief, Abd-el-Kader (who has behaved most nobly throughout the business), were murdered at once. But, although the affair might have been stopped with the greatest ease before dark on the Monday, after that hour the mob increased in numbers every minute. Late in the evening about 300 soldiers were sent to put a stop to the outrage, but very shortly joined in the plundering; such as did not do so, actually used their arms to massacre the Christians. The whole Christian quarter—which includes some of the finest palaces to be found in the empire—was soon one mass of flames; and—for this there is the positive authority of an European eye-witness, who was hiding in the neighbourhood all that fearful night—as the Christians tried to escape from the flames they were thrust back on the burning piles by the bayonets of the Turkish regular troops. However, when we recollect that one of the military chiefs who commanded in Damascus was Osman Beg, the miscreant who but three weeks previously had delivered up at Hasbeya upwards of fifteen hundred Christians to be massacred by the Druses, all wonder at the conduct of the military ceases at once. An Englishman, who has shown great personal courage and example throughout this awful tragedy, writes that from the very first the mob cried out that the soldiers were on their side and would not hurt them, using this as an argument to their brother fanatics to 'kill all the dogs of Christians, not to spare one; to burn their houses, plunder their property, dishonour their wives, tear in pieces their children, and rid the holy city of all save the true followers of the true prophet.' In another letter, from a sober-minded Englishman, whose word no one

can doubt who knows the man, the writer says—'All this last fearful night, Turkish soldiers and Moslem men, women and children continue to pass my door in an unbroken stream; all laden with spoil, most drunk with blook and rapine, all blaspheming the name of Christ and Christians in shouts fearful to hear and too horrid to repeat.'

"What the Turkish authorities did may be summed up in one word—'Nothing.' No less than six times did that gallant old man Mr. Brent, the English Consul, and the Reverend Mr. Robson, Irish Presbyterian missionary, at the utmost risk of their lives, go together to the Pacha Achmet and urge him to do something to save the lives of the Christians. No: he said he could, and showed that he would, do nothing, but remained 'consulting' in the castle. When the last despatches left Damascus, at two p.m., on Thursday, the 12th instant, the burning, slaughter, murder, pillage, and other atrocities continued not merely as bad, but worse than ever, for the miscreant fanatics of the place had been just then joined by a host of Bedouins, Kurds, Druses, and other scoundrels, who were only too happy for the chance of pillage.

"When our last advices from Damascus left that place, the whole Christian quarter had been utterly destroyed. Four thousand Christians had taken refuge in the house of Abd-el-Kader, who defended them against all comers. Three thousand had taken refuge in the castle under the Pacha, and several hundred in the English Consulate, which as yet—being situated in the Moslem quarter of the town—had been respected. Upwards of 2,000 Christians, it was calculated, had been murdered all in cold blood; and the estimated loss of property, money, valuables, &c., was £1,200,000 sterling.

"It will hardly be believed that, with all these facts more or less known to the authorities, the Turkish troops who arrived here before daybreak on Tuesday, the 10th instant, from Constantinople, only left yesterday (Saturday the 14th) for Damascus.

"From Aleppo, the news is bad. They had not heard of the

Damascus massacre, but fully expected, almost every hour, the Moslems of the town to rise on the Christians. Captain Paynter, of her Majesty's ship Exmouth, senior naval officer here, has despatched her Majesty's ship Mohawk to Latakia and Alexandretta, so as to pick up and save fugitives from Moslem fanaticism.

"In Beyrout the panic among the native Christians has been something fearful yesterday and to-day. They are embarking by hundreds in the different merchant steamers to Alexandretta, Alexandria, Corfu, Malta, and even for England. Nearly all the French and English merchants are sending away their families to Europe. All trade is stopped for the present. Syria has had a blow from which she will not recover for sixty years. Men who were yesterday wealthy are now, owing to these disturbances and the bad faith shown by the Turkish Government, beggars. Six weeks ago commercial bills used to be paid at maturity as punctually in Beyrout as in London; now a bill due is a bill protested. Native merchants shut up their magazines and are off—off anywhere to get away from Turkish rule and treachery. In Alexandria all the refugees that have fled there have been very handsomely treated by Said Pacha, who gives food to the poorest, money to many, houses to all. In Beyrout the English and Americans have formed a fund to relieve the poor, who have fled to this place in thousands. The French have done the same. The Sisters of Charity have relieved hundreds every day with food. The French, English, Russian, Austrian, and Prussian consuls (to say nothing of the American missionaries, who daily feed 300 people) give bread, cooked meat, rice, clothes, &c., to several hundreds of these poor, starved, burnt-out peasants. All the medical men have attended to their wounds and sickness gratis, and even the crews of her Majesty's ships Exmouth and Mohawk, as well as the French imperial frigate Zènobie, have contributed their mites.

"What have the local Turkish authorities done to relieve

all this misery—for gigantic misery it must be, considering there are 150 Christian villages burnt, and 75,000 Christians without home or bread—what, I ask, have the local Turkish authorities done to relieve this misery, either individually or collectively? The answer is in one word—'nothing,' absolutely and literally nothing; not one penny have they given in the way of food, clothing, or shelter!"

In a letter from Damascus, in December, we find the following account of the frightful mortality amongst the unfortunate survivors of the Maronites of the Lebanon :—

"From statements that have been made to me by one whose word I have every reason to believe, that the Moslems of Damascus had sworn on the Koran that, as soon as the infidels had left Syria, no Christian should be left alive within a summer day's journey of the Holy City. I believe that if we want Syria to be quiet, and don't wish for the renewal of the horrors of last year, the present French army of occupation must remain at any rate over the spring. The mortality amongst the Christians of the Lebanon is fearful to contemplate. The bad and insufficient food which they have had to put up with, the want of houses to shelter them from the weather, and the mental anxiety, only too natural to men who have lost their all, and to women who have lost their husbands, sons, brothers, and fathers, is beginning to tell upon them. I have the authority of Colonel Burnaby, of the Guards—that excellent English officer who has volunteered for the mission of helping the Christians to rebuild their houses—for saying that, in very many of the Christian villages, the people are dying at the rate of sixty per cent! This is something fearful to contemplate. At this rate the whole of the mixed districts of the mountain would be entirely depopulated in less than two years. And, remember, this mortality is notwithstanding the large sums spent by the British Syrian Relief Fund and the various French charities to relieve the sufferers."

THE STATE OF DAMASCUS.

The following letter from Damascus, dated August 4th, was published in the "Levant Herald." It gives a deplorable account of the state of the city, and of the measures taken by Fuad Pacha on his arrival:—

"I was quite right in my prediction that the people of Damascus would not have the courage to fight. Before daylight yesterday morning several parts of the city were occupied by troops; lists of the guilty were entrusted to superior officers sent to different quarters; every outlet from the city was guarded overnight, and before sunset 360 men—all of whom are supposed to have earned death—were prisoners. Not a shot was fired, nor was it required; there was nothing like resistance, except in the case of two individuals, who were at once bayonetted by the soldiers. One man was drowned in attempting to hide himself in a well. These, in fact, were all the casualties of yesterday. The villains betrayed each other in every direction; one man, whose name was on the list of an officer, helped to find out thirty criminals, and when he had finished was, to his immense surprise, himself disarmed and arrested as the actual murderer of five persons. The arrests and the delivery up of stolen property have continued all day. Both yesterday and to-day the streets have been almost deserted, and the shops and bazaars closed. A Mussulman, who had some property belonging to a Christian woman delivered to him for safety during the pillage, poisoned the woman with arsenic in some sweetmeats, which he sent her as a present in her concealment. He was executed to-day. This is the first capital sentence as yet carried out by virtue of the authority given to Fuad Pacha. Nazir (?) Pacha and the superior and general officers who have the commission for the summary trial of the prisoners, will not assemble for this purpose for three days yet. I may add that accounts from all parts of

the country, inclusive of Jerusalem and Aleppo, are most satisfactory. The same is reported from the towns along the coast. In fact, the vigour with which Fuad Pacha is acting has already struck terror into the minds of all. It is useless writing you a long letter of description, than which nothing would be easier, with the abundance of materials for 'effect' before me. A few words will say all that need be said in this way now. A bombardment of a month would not have reduced the Christian quarter of Damascus to the state to which the fury of a mob reduced it in a quarter of the time: but few of the walls, even of the houses, remain upright. The gates leading from the Turkish quarter, with the exception of one, are all walled up, and the melancholy desert—peopled only by the butchered dead—is separated from the living city by a chain of military posts. These precautious are used to prevent people from exploring in search of valuables. The dead are supposed to have been all removed, but in more than one spot I have seen here an arm, there a foot, protruding from the charred ruins which were so lately palaces; and at points innumerable, one's olfactories discover other traces of barely concealed bodies, which tell how many yet lie nearly where they fell in the terrible struggle. A great quantity of buried treasure is being dug up daily, the owners being accompanied by a guard and witness to certify that the deposits were found in the place previously described. In the yard of one of the churches there is a deep well; and as the enclosure became crowded with fugitives, and the outward tumult came nearer and nearer, those who had money or jewels flung them into the well. After the massacre, some bodies were also flung into the same well by the mob; and when some days after, a man attempted to descend in search of the jewellery, he was killed by the noxious gasses. Another subsequent attempt proved nearly as fatal; and the treasure, therefore, and its horrible protectors, remained untouched. But enough of the past; the present is this:—The Castle is still crowded with Christians—another convoy of a thousand leaves this evening. All these

people are fed by the government, and the military school and the hospitals have been turned into places of reception by the government medical officers. The arrival of Fuad Pacha, with a large body of troops, on Sunday last, has completely cowed the city, and the wrong-doers see certain punishment staring them in the face. His first piece of conduct on arriving told immensely all over the city. Some tents had been pitched on the plain near Nicca, where the governor of the town and the principal citizens were to receive the imperial deputy. But Fuad, having pushed on before the column of troops, arrived before he was expected. He found, however, the military and civil pacha, and the leading men of the place, together with Abd-el-Kader, awaiting him. He brusquely dismissed the civilians *en masse*, and said he desired only to speak with the military men and the Emir. The others passed out of the tent crest-fallen beyond description—all the more so that many of them were rather more than suspected of complicity in the late barbarities. On Fuad's arriving in the city, however, they all flocked to the Serai, expecting to be received at the Pacha's levee; but here again they were disappointed; the sentries would not let a man of them enter. In dismay they withdrew and held a general meeting—not a frequent event here—to which all the civilians and big wigs of the city were invited. 'Indignation' votes of every sort were mooted. One proposed that all present should remove from the city *en masse* with their families; another that a deputation should be at once sent to Constantinople; another something else; but finally, as was to be expected, nothing was 'carried,' but each man present skulked home to his house, and none of the whole of them have been seen out since. The effect of all on this on the lower classes has been great—they fear that some terrible retribution is coming on them, and are doing all they can each to escape from his well-merited share of it. Every night quantities of furniture, carpets, clothing, and other articles, the produce of the village, are disregarded, and flung secretly into the street. The irregulars, too, are constantly escorting

trains of camels bringing in the plunder found in the neighbouring villages. The forces at present at Damascus appear to be sufficient to assure the Pasha against the consequences of any measures he may undertake for the punishment of the guilty, but as he has done nothing of any moment as yet, he is probably awaiting the arrival of still further reinforcements which are expected at Beyrout to-morrow or the day after. That he will do something serious, however, neither the natives nor the Europeans for a moment doubt—once he has his force in hand. The cause of civilization and toleration has found unexpected allies in the followers of Abd-el-Kader, 400 of whom have been already taken into pay, and 2,000 more have offered their services. The conduct of the Emir and many of his men in protecting the Christians provoked the native Mussulman *canaille* to call them *ghiaours*, and for this they will clear scores if opportunity offers. In short we have all the materials ready mixed for such an explosion as—if not overruled by Fuad—the world has not heard of since the Indian mutiny at all events.

In a letter from the "Times" correspondent from Syria, the latter end of August, the writer asks:—

"What is to be done with the Druses? Fuad Pacha has made a vigorous beginning at Damascus of his work of justice. About 200 executions have taken place, and many more, it is expected, will follow. The mere punishment of the criminals in this affair, however, is the smallest part of the difficulty which encounters us, for what are we to do with the Druses? They declare their intention of retiring into the mountains, and if we let them get there it will be a long piece of business dragging them out of those natural fastnesses, from which Ibrahim Pacha retired with only 9,000 men left out of an army of 40,000. The great Druse Chief, Mohammed el Nasar, the instigator of these butcheries, proclaims openly his contempt of the Sultan, and defies retaliation. This man is a curious specimen of a savage with just a smack of European ideas, and just enough knowledge of European politics

to set him on a wrong tack, and add to his brutality the inspiration of conceit. He sets up as something of a gentleman, and cultivates English acquaintance, so far as a fortress in the mountains enables him to do so. His fortress itself has pretensions to being a palace, and exhibits corridors and galleries, marbles and gilding. He has entertained English travellers quite lately in his chateau, and he does us the honour to have a mighty respect for us. The civilization of these men is only skin deep, and what they know about us, their European stock of ideas, sticks like so much plaster upon the wild aboriginal intellect, with which it refuses to amalgamate, and of which it is only an unsightly, discordant, outside decoration. Nana Sahib was a savage of this stamp—a gentleman savage, who consorted with English officers, and talked like a would-be European. We know how far enlightenment went in his mind. The only use to which, it seems, Mohammed has turned his knowledge of the civilized world, is to start the idea that a massacre of the Maronites would be extremely grateful to England, as being a blow to French interests in Syria. That is just the sort of truth which a barbarian acquires from a smattering of Western life and politics. This man, it appears, really fancied himself a European politician, and thought that he had the head of a cabinet statesman on his shoulders in planning this desperate and horrible scheme of Christian massacre. He counted on English support, and therefore, it need not be added, on an English reward. He had, doubtless, before him the vision of an expanded and exalted tribe; of an alliance of England and the Druses, which would bring the latter out of their barren fastnesses, and introduce them to the luxury and capital of the world; and finally of himself mounting on his tribe's success, and becoming a great man and head of the English party in Syria. What is to be done with the Druses and their chieftans, then, when the Moslems have been hung or shot in sufficient numbers to satisfy justice? That is a much more difficult affair. Fuad Pasha is taking vigorous steps to prevent a retreat to the

mountains, and, if the force which has just left Damascus under the command of Hassan Bey executes its object, these savages will not only be intercepted, but divided, and one-half prevented from communicating with the other. This manœuvre, if it is accomplished, will bring the savages to terms, and the loss of so many heads will follow. But we do not profess to enter on a regular intervention on Syrian affairs now simply as executioners or spectators of executions. What we want to do is to lay down such a plan of administration that such a massacre can never occur again. We want as Christian Powers to guarantee security for the future to the Christian population of Syria. But it will be a great puzzle how to do this without its being of the nature of a permanent interposition in the affairs of Syria. As for the Turkish Government, it has no physical strength, and still less any moral weight, No Turkish Government will ever unteach the Druses the habits of savages and the thirst for blood. They can be made to feel nothing but force, and the only guarantee for the future security of the Christian population will be a constant pressure of European strength upon them in such a shape that they will see that to kill a Christian is to fight with Europe. European power must be felt, in short, as practically as Syrian power, and how to manage this without a permanent intervention in Syria, and a European commission to govern the Pasha is the difficulty which we have to solve."

The *Moniteur*, of the — of August, 1860, contains the protocol of the sitting of the Ambassadorial conference, on the affairs of Syria, held at the Foreign-office, in Paris. The following is a full translation :—

First protocol of the conference held at the Foreign-office, on the 3rd of August, 1860.

His Imperial Majesty the Sultan, being desirous to arrest, by prompt and efficacious measures, the blood-shed in Syria, and to show his firm resolution to insure order and peace among the populations placed under his sovereignty,

And their Majesties, the Emperor of the French, the Em-

peror of Austria, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, his Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Prussia, and His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, having offered their co-operation, which his Majesty the Sultan has accepted.

The representatives of their above-enumerated Majesties, and of His Royal Highness, have agreed upon the following articles:—

Art. 1. A body of European troops, which may be brought to twelve thousand men, will be directed to Syria, with the view of contributing to the re-establishment of tranquillity.

Art. 2. His Majesty the Emperor of the French consents to furnish immediately, one-half of this number of troops. Should it become necessary to fill up the whole number, as stipulated in the preceding article, the High Powers, without delay, will come to an understanding with the Porte in the ordinary diplomatic way, about the designation of those powers among them which are to make provision for it.

Art. 3. The Commander-in-Chief of the expedition, on his arrival, will enter into communication with the Extraordinary Commissioner of the Porte, for the purpose of combination of the measures required by the circumstances of the case, and for that of taking up what positions may recommend themselves in connection with the fulfilment of the object of the present act.

Art. 4. Their Majesties, the Emperor of the French, the Emperor of Austria, the Queen of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, His Royal Highness the Prince Regent of Prussia, and His Majesty the Emperor of all the Russias, promise to furnish (the French is *d'entretenir*) such naval forces as will be sufficient for assisting the success of the common efforts for re-establishing tranquillity on the Syrian shore (*sur le littoral.*)

Art. 5. The high contracting parties, convinced that such a space of time will be sufficient to attain the object of pacifica-

tion they have in view, fix the duration of the occupation by European troops in Syria (sic: *en Syrie*) to six months.

Art. 6. The Sublime Porte undertakes to facilitate as much as will depend upon her the maintenance and provisioning of the expeditionary corps.

It is understood that the six preceding articles are to be transformed into a convention, which shall receive the signatures of the representatives, signers of the present, as soon as they shall have been provided with full powers by their sovereigns, but that the stipulations of this protocol itself are to be in force immediately.

The chargé d'affaires of Prussia, nevertheless, observes, that the present distribution of the Prussian ships of war may not permit his Government to co-operate, for the present, in the execution of Article 4.

Done at Paris, the 3rd of August, 1860, in six different copies.

THOUVENEL,
METTERNICH,
COWLEY,
REUSS KISSELEFF,
AHMED VEFYK.

The following is the second protocol of the conference, held at the Foreign-office, on the 3rd August, 1860:—

The plenipotentiaries of France, Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, desirous to establish, in conformity with the intentions of their respective courts, the true character of the assistance accorded to the Sublime Porte on the terms of the protocol of this same day, the sentiments which have dictated the clauses of this act, and their complete disinterestedness, declare, in the most formal way, that the contracting Powers neither mean to, nor will pursue, while fulfilling their engagements, any territorial advantage, nor any exclusive influence, nor any concession with regard to the commerce of

their subjects, which would not be conceded to the subjects of all other nations.

Nevertheless, they cannot bring themselves to abstain, in calling back to memory the acts emanated from his Majesty, the Sultan, of which article 9 of the treaty of March 30, 1856, has confirmed the high value, from expressing the importance (*le prix*) which their respective courts attach to the adaptation, in conformity with the solemn promises of the Sublime Porte, of serious administrative measures for ameliorating the fate of the Christian population (*des populations*) of whatever church (*rite*) in the Ottoman empire.

The Plenipotentiary of Turkey takes notice (*prend acte*) of this declaration of the High Powers, and undertakes to transmit it to his court, drawing attention to the fact that the Sublime Porte *has* directed, and will continue to direct, its efforts in the sense of the wish expressed above.

Done at Paris, 3rd August, 1860, in six copies.

THOUVENEL,
METTERNICH,
COWLEY,
REUSS KISSELEFF,
AHMED VEFYK.

Before the other Christian Governments of Europe had fully recovered from the shock which they experienced on suddenly hearing of the unexpected slaughter of the Christians of Lebanon and of Damascus by their old implacable enemies the Druses and the Turks, the Emperor of the French had completed his preparations for sending a military expedition to Syria.

A French division, consisting of infantry, artillery, engineers, and marines, stated to number in all some six thousand men, with a full complement of guns, ammunition, and military stores of all kinds, were ready to sail from Marseilles for the coast of Syria, in the beginning of August, to be followed in due course by other detachments.

The first body of French troops landed at Beyrout on the 16th of August, 1860.

The correspondent of a London journal writes from Beyrout the 10th of September, 1860:

EXECUTION OF ACHMET PACHA AT DAMASCUS.

An express from Damascus reached Beyrout to-day to say that on Saturday, the 8th instant, Achmet Pacha, late Governor General of Damascus, together with three other superior officers of the Turkish army (all deeply concerned in the late massacres), were shot by order of Fuad Pacha. The sentence was that of the military court-martial by which they were tried. The three other officers executed are Osman Bey, the miscreant who, being in command of the Turkish troops at Hasbeiya when the Druses attacked the place, first persuaded the whole Christian population of the town to go into the Serai, or Government House, promising them protection. He then made them give up to him as the representative of the Sultan's government, all their arms, and when this was done—when all the Christian inhabitants, to the amount of some two thousands, were perfectly at his mercy—he let in the Druses, by whom every man and every male child was ruthlessly butchered in cold blood—Osman Bey's troops helping in the fearful tragedy, and adding to the measure of their iniquity by ill-treating and violating many of the women. The next on the list Ali Bey, was, like Osman Bey, a colonel in the Turkish army. He it was who, being in command of the troops in the streets of Damascus on the 9th of July, when the disturbance broke out, instead of using the ample means he had to put down the insurrection, suffered his fanatical zeal to get the better of his judgment, and allowed his men to help the mob. The latter thus taking courage proceeded from bad to worse, the ruffian rabble raised the cry that the troops were with them, and the result was as we know, the massacre of five thousand Christians. The last

executed was Mustapha Bey, of whom it is enough to say that he behaved at Rasheiya exactly the same as Osman Bey did at Hasbeiya, and with the same results. All three—Osman Ali, and Mustapha—were Turkish colonels; all three acted as worthy lieutenants of their infamous superior, Achmet—and all three have suffered death with him. Lord Dufferin arrived here from Constantinople on Sunday, the 2nd inst; Monday, the 3rd, he remained all day in conference with Admiral Martin and Mr. Moore, the Consul General; Tuesday he started for Damascus arriving there late on Thursday. The next day he had a long interview with Fuad Pacha, and on Saturday the execution of the four fanatical traitors took place. Judging from these followings of events, it is but natural to conclude that it was his lordship's firmness that caused Fuad to carry out the sentence on the culprits.

One and all of the Druses—sheiks and peasants—are, as well they may be, in a very great fright for the future. They feel that, with few exceptions, they have called down upon themselves the vengeance of the Christian powers, and bitterly openly regret the madness which made them join hands with the Turks for the extermination of the Christians. *Nor do they mince matters when they speak of the Ottoman government, which, as they now begin to see, has first made use of them, and now wants to turn them adrift.* They say, that if called upon to give testimony before any honest commission, they will give such evidence, and such proof, as will yet open the eyes of all Europe. But they make two stipulations—first, that no Turkish official should be a member of the commission; and, secondly, that at least one Englishman have a voice and vote in its proceedings. Strange to say, the Druse chief, who appears certainly the most implicated of all those on the mountain in those fearful massacres is, or appears to be, a certain Sheik Syad Bey Djemblat, of Mooktara, the wealthiest landowner in all Syria, and one who made a great profession of being a friend of Englishmen. During the time of the Egyptian government, the father of this chief was exiled, and he himself made to serve

as a common soldier in the Egyptian army. It was by English influence alone, that he was brought back to the Lebanon, and restored to his heritage. If this man did not join, it is certain his immense influence could have prevented the fearful massacres which have lately taken place in and around the Lebanon. But I fear he is deeply in the dirt. One of his kayaihs, or deputy-governors, was the presiding genius at the massacre of Deir-el-Kammar, a fiend in human shape, called Ali Bey Hamaddee, a scoundrel who fought well, and gained his title of Bey at Kars. Whilst another of Syad Bey's deputies, called Cassim Yeseph, plundered and burnt the very wealthy convent of Der Mohalis, besides conducting the massacres at Sidon. Both these men are up to their very chins in murder and plunder, yet their superior, Syad Bey Djemblat, is trying hard to make the world here believe that he, without whose orders neither of these men would have dared to move a hand, is perfectly innocent.

A very large body of the Turkish prisoners passed through Beyrout the other day, singing one of the refrains of the Druse war song, "how sweet it is to shed the blood of Christians;" but the next batch, which arrived three nights ago, were escorted to the barracks by a detachment of French hussars, who have rather different notions about the propriety of prisoners' behaviour than have the Turkish regular troops. May God grant I may never again see such a sight as I witnessed three days ago at Deir-el-Kammar! and such would be the prayer of any man who has been in that town since the massacre.—Although the place was under the special government of the Sultan, no effort whatever has been made to bury the dead, even at this date of two months and a half after the tragedy. What has been done to hasten the disappearance of human bodies has been effected by the dogs, and wolves, and jackals of the surrounding districts. It was a fearful scene. Here stood, ninety days ago, a thriving town of 8,000 souls and upwards, and when the troubles in Lebanon broke out, nearly 2,000 Christians from various parts had sought refuge in the

place. Where are now those images of God? Where are the comfortable homes, the thriving trades, the rich silk crops, the produce of grapes and olives, the hundreds of working silk looms that this population possessed? Where are the wives and daughters of these traders and landowners, where the happy children, the hearty welcome which all strangers received, the wealth in dress and jewels with which the matrons were adorned? The men of the place—ay, and some of the women, too, for I counted no less than a dozen in one spot—the men are here, these corrupting masses of putrid skulls are all that remains of them; their houses are all burnt or pulled down; their property all plundered or destroyed; their women beggars in the streets of Beyrout; their male children hacked to pieces by the knives of the Druses. Amongst so many horrors it was difficult to select one place more fearful than another, but the Maronite Church and the Turkish Governor's divan, or receiving room, exceeded all I could have believed possible. The former is surrounded by a small court yard, the door of which was shut. When we opened it the stench was something hardly to be conceived. On the pavement in front of the church, to which a large portion of the inhabitants had evidently fled for shelter, the dead bodies lay literally heaped in dozens one upon another, as they had been murdered and flung down. The steps up to the church are white, and down them was a broad purple mark of twenty or thirty feet long, from the interior of the altar rails out far beyond the door, which told but too plainly the tale of murder. The body of the church is about the size of the Lock Chapel, in the Harrow-road, the court-yard is broader, but about half its length. But in no part of that church, on no inch of that court, could any man, put he his steps ever so nicely, walk without putting his foot on some part or other of a dead man's body. The skeletons are, with few exceptions, perfectly naked, for every survivor of the massacre that I have questioned—and more than a hundred have related the same tale to various parties in Beyrout—say, so cold-blooded were the Druses in their murderous work, that,

before butchering a man, whose clothes were at all good, they first made him undress himself, and then hacked him to pieces with their long knives, thus preserving his garments uncut and unstained by blood. For some reason or other, however, they appear not to have taken the Maronite priests' clothes, as I observed many of the corpses clad in the black coarse gown of the monks. The church and court-yard were strewn with torn church books and broken church ornaments; but here, as everywhere else all that could be turned to the slightest use, even to the wooden lintels of the doors and the frames of the windows, had been taken away by the marauding hordes of murderers. But even more than by the sight of the Maronite church, was I astonished and sickened on going into the Turkish Governor's room, in the far interior of the Serai. Here the great slaughter seems to have taken place. Here—two and a half months after these murders—the ground of the room was still discoloured and fat with human blood. Here still lay about fragments of torn dresses and clothing, bearing witness of many fearful deeds of blood. And here, below the large window of the room, lay heap upon heap and pile upon pile of corrupting human bodies, a seething mass of advanced putrefaction. Here, too, were torn mass books and gospels in numbers, and also many pages of a well printed edition of "Fenelon's Life," in French, showing that in this, the government house, no doubt some of the better educated Christian community had sought a refuge, but had found a grave. My very soul sickened at all I had seen, and I left the town sooner than I otherwise would had I remained to see everything that bore witness to the bloodthirstyness of the Druses, or the iniquitous treachery of the Turks. On both may the sentence come of "Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed."

The writer of the foregoing letter was much mistaken about the certainty of the Druses *surrendering to a man.* Neither threats nor blandishments have had any effect on the majority of them in the way of inducement to repair to the head-quarters of Fuad Pacha.

If the Druse Chiefs were innocent of the murders of Deir-el-Kammar, Hasbeya, and Rasheya, if they could prove their hands were guiltless of Christian blood, and their castles unenriched with Christian spoil, Lord Dufferin would have exerted the great power and authority with which he was invested, to protect the chiefs of a people who, according to Lord Carnarvon, are the fast friends of England. Only a few, however, came down to abide that "impartial trial" which they sought. They sullenly refused to give any account of their participation in the massacres which have filled the world with horror, and if any foreign army landed on the Syrian coast they would mince it up just as they did the unsuspecting inhabitants of the convent of the Moon! But their threats soon sunk into fear when French soldiers appeared on the scene. All their boasting evaporated in presence of the few thousands of troops sent out by the French Government. They fled at the first approach of danger, and prepared to escape into the Hauran, which served them so often before as a refuge. This district, bounded on the north by the Anti-Libanus, and on the south and east by the desert, is the mountain fortress of the Druses. There the Lebanon Sheiks and their followers have always found shelter when hard pushed on the south, and there they have now forced their way, joined their brethren in the Hauran, and escaped by the connivance of the Turkish soldiers. It was determined by the French and Turkish authorities to force Druse fastnesses, and bring the chiefs to bay. It was a formidable proceeding, and the wise heads at Beyrout contemplated calamitous results to the expeditionary columns. The Druses were armed to the teeth. Their position was impregnable, and their guns long of carriage and fatal in precision. While they were collecting the vast wealth plundered from the Christians, and before they could store it away in the Hauran, two columns, one French, and the other Turkish, started from two points on the coast, Sidon and Beyrout. These were to advance over the Lebanon, driving before them the Druses, whilst two other Turkish brigades were to push out from

Damascus, spread along the Cœlo-Syrian valley, and, whilst interposing between the Druses and the Hauran, force them back on the columns advancing from the coast. This plan was well arranged, and if properly carried out would have resulted in success. The French column, commanded by General D'Hautpoul, and the Turkish by Ismail Pacha, the Hungarian Kmety, consisting of four thousand French and six thousand Turks, did their work well. The Druses fled before them, and breaking up into small bodies as they advanced, soon came on the Turkish brigades stationed to prevent their escape into the Hauran. Between these brigades the flying Druses passed without molestation.

Consul-General Moore, in a despatch to Sir H. Bulwer from Beyrout, dated 30th June, 1860, when the Massacres of Damascus and several other places in the Lebanon had not taken place, gives the following "approximate estimate of the result of the civil war in the Lebanon up to the present time," that is to say up to June 30, 1860:

Christian villages burnt . . .	150
Christians killed in warfare, 500; do. massacred, 5,500 . . .	6,000
Christian sufferers by the war . .	75,000

Of the 75,000 sufferers above mentioned 15,000 widows and orphans are computed to exist.

Consul Brant estimates the number massacred in Damascus the 18th July, 1860, at 2,000, and the value of the property plundered and destroyed, at £1,000,000 sterling.

Mr. Graham, in his letter to Lord Dufferin from Beyrout, dated 11th July, 1860, estimates the number massacred at Der-el-Kammar at from 1,000 to 1,200; at Hasbeya and Rasheya, 700, at Sidon, 550, near Beyrout on 30th and 31st May, refugees from the mountains, 200, and in the several villages about 1,000, total 3,650.

But the number massacred in Damascus on the 11th July, 2,000, is not taken into account by Mr. Graham in his dispatch of the 18th of July. This addition to his estimate would make

the numbers of the massacred 5,650. But he has greatly under-rated the number of the massacred at Hasbeyah and Rasheyak. Instead of 700 it should have been 1,000 at least. This would make the number the same as Mr. Moore's estimate.

The persons massacred were all males.

The loss to predial labour in the Maronite community must consequently have been the more severely felt.

But none of the Consuls, or other persons who have made reports on these raides and massacres, make any estimate of the number of women and young children captured by the Druses, carried into slavery, and who still, to the great disgrace of the Turkish Government, remain in slavery.

The people who committed these terrible atrocities, the Druses of the Lebanon, have perpetrated them with entire impunity, not a single Druse chief, up to this date, thanks to an effectual intervention in their behalf with Fuad Pacha, on the part of Lord Dufferin and Sir H. Bulwer, with the Porte, has suffered the penalty of his crimes.

Very uncommon pains have been taken (strange to say by persons who could have no interest in defeating the ends of justice) to screen the Druses from the chastisement they so well deserved for their wholesale murders, pillages, and captures of women and children. Nay, these persons have gone to the extent of preventing the surviving Maronites from proceeding against them for the recovery of the property carried away by the marauders, by entering into what they call treaties of peace with them and undertaking to indemnify them for the past, and to exempt them for the future from any proceedings against them on account of their late murders and robberies.

This was done by Mr. Consul General Moore, of Beyrout, no doubt with the best intentions, and thus has this treaty making proceeding been viewed by a brave and noble minded British naval officer, Captain Paynter.

In a despatch dated July 13th, 1860: "A treaty of peace between the Druses under the auspices of the Turkish autho-

rities was signed yesterday. A few only of the principal Christian chiefs have attached their signatures. 'Oblivion for the past!' 'Non surrender of plunder!' And 'no indemnification for property destroyed!' forms the ground work of this treaty."*

When the mission to the Druses was adopted by Consul General Moore and his colleagues, and a treaty of peace proposed to them in a letter which Mr. Moore addressed to one of the principal Druse Shieks, Ismail-el-Ataash when he refers to this chief's recently attacking Zahlee, and committing, as reported to Mr. Moore, barbarous cruelties against the Christians at several places, he adds:

"I never thought that any Druse chief would have committed such barbarous cruelties at the time the English nation used to think that the Druses are as remarkable for bravery on the field of battle, and legitimate warfare as they are for chivalry and magnanimity in the cause of humanity."†

Heaven defend us and all our tribe from such bravery on the field of battle in legitimate warfare, such chivalry and magnanimity at the call of humanity as the Druse chieftains displayed in the massacres of the Maronites, with whose blood their swords were reeking, at the very time that they are reminded of that chivalry and magnanimity for which they are so remarkable!

Consul Finn, of Jerusalem, followed the example of Consul General Moore, at Beyrout.

He prevailed on a Mr. Peter Meshullam to go on a peace-making mission to the Druses in the beginning of July, 1860, and at Moktara this gentleman harrangued the assembled Druses, in terms that could not fail to make them think very highly of the lofty position in which they stood in the estimation of the English nation.

One passage was to the following effect: "You Druses say

* See Parliamentary Papers, No. 21.

† See Parliamentary Papers, No. 13.

that the English have got a great interest in you, and that they are your friends; do you think it proper to trouble them because they are your friends. Would you like them to enter into a war with some other European nation for your sake, and have 50,000 or 60,000 of their best men killed, and you to be the cause? *The Turkish Government may not seem to blame you for this last war, as it appears to them, by the documents in your hands, that the Christians commenced it*, and would not stop it till you had utterly destroyed their best villages, and killed their best men; but other nations may lay the blame on both yourselves and the Government."*

How tenderly the atrocities of the murderous Druse banditti, are dealt with by this messenger of peace on the mission he was sent by Mr. Consul Finn.

It is a great pity that Mr. Consul Finn, who must have some legitimate consular duties to perform, should give himself all this trouble with Mr. Peter Meshullam, and his unauthorized, bombastic mission to the Druses. The mission that was consulted or called for to them was one of military force for the purpose of chastisement and not of cajolery.

The Maronites were not represented by him or by Mr. Consul General Moore and his colleague, when they undertook to propose the terms of peace that were to be entered into by them and the Maronites, without a single stipulation for the restitution of the property they had robbed, and the restoration of the women and children they had carried away, after the massacre of their friends and relatives, into slavery.

If the Druses had been engaged in a great defensive war carried on in the way that modern warfare is waged, they could not be addressed in terms more calculated to make them feel they had been engaged in a legitimate struggle in this "last war" of theirs with the Maronites. Not one word of indignation is expressed at the horrible butcheries they have been just committing, not one syllable of advice to them is uttered

* See Parliamentary Papers, No. 27.

to give back the property they had lately plundered, to restore the women and children of the unfortunate Maronites they had so cruelly butchered in cold bold. But on the contrary, they are made to believe they are greatly beloved by the English nation, and highly prized for their valour and good behaviour.

All the spirits that tend on mortal thoughts, whose aim is evil were surely busy with the brains of those remorseless pagan Druses, when they engaged in this bloody work of direst cruelty the latter end of May, 1860, and persisted in it till the middle of July following.

> "No compunctious visitings of nature
> Shook their fell purpose, nor kept peace between
> The effect and it."

The "murth'ring ministers," who wait on natures mischief, tended on them morning, noon, and night, stalked about them in their dreams, haunted their imaginations in their waking moments, hounding them on, continuously to carnage, shouting in their ears incessantly—kill, kill, kill, and pointing out the victims who were to be slain—the Christians, who were Rayahs.

In modern times no calamities have been recorded so terrible to think of as those massacres, the horrors of which have been described by Consul Brant, of Damascus, Consul General Moore of Beyrout, and Mr. Graham in their accounts of the frightful atrocities perpetrated at Sour, Rasheya and several other places.

If ever wretched people in our times had awful experience of afflictions on afflictions suddenly and swiftly, as one flash of lightning following another, falling on them without preparation, defence, or shelter, "so that whoever shall hear of them their ears shall tingle," it surely was the Maronites. No other people in our days could so fully comprehend as the survivors of this recent carnage of Christians, the words of lamentation—

"Teach your daughters wailings and every one her neighbour mourning.

"For death is come up through your windows, to destroy the children without, the young men from the streets.

"Speak, thus saith the Lord: even the carcases of men shall be as dung upon the face of the country, and as grass behind the back of the mower and there is none to gather it."*

The Turks in Damascus, Hasbeya, and Rasheya, have dealt with the survivors of the Maronites, in strict accordance with the principles of their religion. And really, when we read the comments on those massacres of some Christians, and notice their efforts to vindicate the murderous Druses and to inculpate their slaughtered, defenceless victims, the Maronites, we almost feel as if the victors were encouraged to renew the work not wholly accomplished on the Lebanon. What is all this eulogising of the valour and magnanimity of the Druses since the perpetration of their recent atrocities on the Roman Catholic inhabitants of the mountain, but language that will be interpreted into encouragement, as much so as if we said to them, of their remaining victims whose doom had been postponed, in so many plain, distinct, and out spoken words:—

"Therefore deliver up their children to famine, and bring them into the hands of the sword: let their wives be bereaved of children and become widows: and let their husbands be slain by death: let their young men be stabbed with the sword in battle."†

How comes it then, that our sympathies would really seem by the reports of our newspaper correspondents sent home from Syria, of the very inadequate measures taken for the punishment of the actors in those scenes of blood, and the comments on them in the House of Commons to be greater for the Druses, the sanguinary wretches by whom these butcheries were made, than for the Maronites; their disarmed, defenceless, unprepared, and unresisting victims.

True it is the Maronites were Roman Catholics and the

* Jerem., chap. ix. v. 19 to 22.

† Jerem., chap. xviii. v. 21.

Druses, by whom they were massacred in cold blood, were not. The latter were only pagans.

Nevertheless, members of the Church of Rome though these Maronites were, they were human beings, and in the carnage of them, humanity was outraged and religion offended, quite as grievously as if the massacred people were enrolled on the lists of proselytes (those lists of marvellously augmented numbers so demonstrative of the fact that miracles are performed in our days by pious Arithmeticians) lists that are periodically returned from Syria by the missionaries, who are connected with Bible Societies in England.

Does humanity recognise one law of sympathy for the wronged and outraged members of a particular church and another law of commiseration for the cruelly injured community of a different religious denomination?

Does the mode of worshipping God determine the way that Christians of any Church are to deal with the most terrible of all calamities that can befall or have befallen our fellow Christians of another?

In modern times, the cruelties committed by slave dealers on the coast of Africa, caused even the introduction into our official vocabulary of such epithets as "miscreants," "monsters," "enemies of the human race," &c., &c.; for with such epithets we find the parliamentary slave trade papers teem. The atrocites, however, committed in Syria on the Maronites who were more immediately entitled to British sympathy, because in point of religious relationship they were bound to us in closer bonds of Christian fellowship, deserved, in my humble opinion, to be placed in the same category of crimes, as those in which are recorded the atrocities of the Spaniards and Portuguese, and to be ranked among the worst outrages on humanity that have ever been committed.

I have elsewhere had occasion to observe, that we are as fully subject as the people of any other country on the face of the earth to the fitful influence of that variable atmosphere of the

feelings which modifies our notions of Christian benevolence, and carries a spirit of conventional Christianity into our dealings with the wrongs and grievances which are brought before us, which at one period and for one class of sufferers enlivens sensibility, and at another time and for another description of unfortunates, stifles every emotion of compassion.

In all the massacres in May, June, and the early part of July, 1860, perpetrated by the Druses, one fact was indubitable, that they were connived at by the Turkish Authorities in all instances; nay, generally speaking secretly encouraged, and in several cases actively assisted by their subordinates and the soldiers at their disposal. This fact was subsequently so well known to Fuad Pacha, the Turkish Commissioner, sent into Syria by the Sultan, that he put to death some forty Turkish officials including Achmed Pacha, the late Governor-General of Damascus, and three superior military officers, colonels, Osman Bey, the most infamous of the wholesale murderers of Christians. who turned the force at his orders against the inhabitants of Hasbeyah, Ali Bey the commandant of the troops in Damascus on the fatal 9th of July, who allowed his soldiers to assist the mob murderers, and Mustapha Bey another Turkish commandant, who acted at Rasheyah as Osman Bey had done at Hasbeyah, Yet British State-craft ignores the fact, that in the late massacres, a large portion of the carnage was the work of Turks.

From a statement made in the House of Commons, on the 19th of July, 1860, respecting the Syrian massacres, it would appear his lordship thought it was a general impression that the Turks had not done *all* they could do to stop these massacres.

"Sir J. Fergusson called the attention of the house to an article in the *Constitutionnel*, giving an account of the steps taken by the French Government to put a stop to the massacre of the Christians in Syria, and asked Lord J. Russell whether he had taken any part, in his position of Foreign Secretary, to prevent the continuance of the terrible massacres; he also asked whether it was true that peace had been agreed to between the tribes of Lebanon, and whether her Majesty had

consented to the intervention of the French Government in Syria.

"Lord J. Russell said it was the general impression that the Turks had not done all they could to stop these massacres, although it was true that the Sultan had sent a considerable body of troops into the disturbed districts. Her Majesty's Government could not object to European troops being sent to Syria, and a convention for that purpose had been signed, to which England, France, Russia, Austria, and Prussia were parties. It was not yet ascertained what steps the Porte would take."

The universal feeling of horror and indignation excited in France by the intelligence of the massacres perpetrated by the Druses and Turks in Syria, and of sympathy for the sufferings of the unfortunate Maronite Christians of the Lebanon, I had an opportunity of witnessing.

The intensity and universality of that feeling in every class of the French people on that occasion, it would be difficult to exaggerate, and it was natural that it should be so, the people who were butchered by Druses and Turks were co-religionists of the French people. In England it cannot be understood that Louis Napoleon was driven, no less by that strongly prevailing feeling of sympathy with the Maronites, than by the obligations imposed on him by treaties of French sovereigns (so early as the time of St. Louis) with Turkish rulers, conferring the privileges of a protectorate over the Maronites, on the sovereigns of France, and was forced by his position to take effectual measures for their protection in their present deplorable circumstances.

Looking, as our Consuls do in the Levant, on the Druses as friends and allies by feelings, though not by treaties with England, it is not to be wondered at that their reports mislead their superiors, and that in proportion as the Maronites are sympathised with in France, the Druses are favourably regarded in England, and their excesses on various grounds exused.

It was high time for some European Power to stand forward

on behalf of humanity so terribly outraged as it had been in Syria in the persons of the Maronite Christians of the Lebanon, when Louis Napoleon first determined on an expedition to Syria, and then invited the other Great Powers to a Conference in Paris on the subject of the proposed expedition.

In a letter from Beirout, dated 31st December, 1860, the correspondent of the *Daily News*, referring to the trials of the Druse prisoners, observes:—

"The chief sheiks are mostly, if not all, *condemned to death*, whilst the Turkish authorities—Koorchid Pacha, Tir Pacha, and about twenty minor officials—escape with comparatively slight punishment; that is, they are ordered to be exiled, which in Turkey means a few months of quiet life in country retirement, then leave to reside on the Bosphorus, and final reinstatement in some new, perhaps a better, appointment. In fact, it means such a fate as befel Namik Pacha, who, three years ago, was pretty deeply implicated in the affair of Jedda, and is now one of the Sultan's Ministers.

"At the Porte, heaven and earth is being moved to save Koorchid and Tir Pacha, the former being a personal friend of the Sultan, the latter the son-in-law of Namik Pacha, the hero of Jedda. To save them, all the Turks implicated in the late disturbances and massacres must be also saved. Compare the state of these unfortunate Druses with that of hundreds of the Moslems who took part in the Damascus massacre. They were seized as conscripts, and sent to Constantinople, where all who could muster the money, upon paying 13,000 piastres (about £100) were at once released, and are now gentlemen at large. Many have returned to Syria, others are sauntering about in Stamboul, boasting of how they slaughtered the Christian men, dishonoured the Chistian women, burnt the Christians' houses, and stole the Christians' money. In fact, a large portion of the proceeds of the plunder in that doomed town, has been used to buy off the scoundrels who were sent as conscripts to the army."

It has been unfortunate for the character of our consistency

in the advocacy of the interests of humanity that so many occasions in the past year have been taken in high places, in Parliament and the Press of defending the perpetrators of those massacres, of representing most untruly the unhappy victims of the Druses as the originators of the conflicts in which they were slaughtered, and in representing the conduct of the Maronites in such odious colours, and that of the Druses in a light so calculated to gain sympathy for them, that the effect of this course is to shield them altogether, as it has done up to the present time, from the punishment they so richly deserved.

The following will serve for an example of the policy I refer to.

In the House of Lords, Monday, February, 26, 1861, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, in pursuance of notice, proceeded to move for correspondence connected with certain events in Syria.

Lord Wodehouse in reply said his noble friend had not exaggerated the importance of events in Syria. The course taken by the Turkish Government, and the Great Powers acting through the French Government, had been of great service in checking the disturbance, and the Turkish Government had shown great energy in punishing the offenders. Nine hundred and twenty persons had been brought to justice for their crimes and condemned, and of those fifty-six were executed, in addition to the commander-in-chief and three other officers who were shot. Measures were taken to capture the principal Druse chiefs, and though many of them escaped, some of the most important offenders were captured and put on their trial at Beyrout. The Lebanon had been occupied with Turkish troops, but during that occupation, he regretted to state, the Christians took the opportunity to revenge themselves on their opponents, and massacred 136 persons, of whom twenty-five were women and eighty-six children. To show the spirit which actuated the Maronites towards the Druses, he might mention that the bishops furnished to the commissioner a list of 4,500 males whom they required should be put to death, although the entire Druse male population amounted

to only 11,000; and on the list being sent back as too large, the bishops furnished a new one of 1,200. Under such circumstances, the work of carrying out justice, mingled with mercy, had been no easy one to go through. He hoped his noble friend would withdraw his motion.

How comes it to pass, I would venture to ask Lord Wodehouse, if the Turkish authorities and Turkish troops in Syria had done their duty, that from the day the massacres commenced, ten months ago, to the present hour, not one of the chiefs of the Druse murderers has been executed.

It is very unfortunate for the exercise of our influence in Syria, that our consuls should allow themselves to become the exponents of the views and opinions of our missionaries in Syria, rather than of British imperial interests, that the Druses should be taken up as our pet race in Syria and our *protégés*, and that the Maronites, Roman Catholic though they be, should be looked upon with such disfavour, and meet with very scant justice at the hands of our consular agents, and in the speeches of those who have to deal with their reports.

In the House of Commons on Monday, the 20th of August, 1861, there was a conversation on Syrian affairs, the substance of which is as follows:—

Mr. Monsell drew the attention of Lord Palmerston to the statement he had made the other day. The noble lord had said that the hostilities in Syria were commenced not by the Druses, but by the Maronites, and he endeavoured to exonerate the Turkish Government from any blame in the transaction.

Lord Palmerston said it was not by any means desirable that the Turkish Empire should be dismembered, a consummation which the hon. member appeared to approve of; but he did not say to which foreign Power he would have that empire transferred. There was no doubt much to be complained of with regard to the Turkish rule, and it was not from any regard for the Turkish character that he was opposed to any such dismemberment, but because it would lead, if not to an European war, to consequences of a very serious description. He (Lord

Palmerston) contended that the Maronites had commenced the disturbances, and he referred to the statements of Lord Cowley and other competent persons in support of that assertion. Although some of the Turkish authorities and officers acted in the way described, the conduct of the Turkish Government subsequent to the disturbances, proved that it was not favourable to the cause of the Druses in regard to these disturbances.

Lord Palmerston was certainly lamentably misinformed by our consular agents in Syria with respect to the hostilities being commenced by the Maronites.

The subject of the Syrian massacres is of too vast and too lasting an importance to be glanced at merely in passages of letters, or articles in newspapers. It is necessary the history of these massacres should be compared with the official documents on this subject that bear on the face of them a certain stamp of authenticity in the Parliamentary papers presented to the House of Commons, in two separate reports made to the order for their production on the 30th of June, 1860, and the latest of them in April, 1861.

These official documents have been examined with no ordinary care and assiduity by the author.

Much is to be learned from them, and a great deal to be dealt with as matter calculated to mislead and to misinform.

Although these official papers are in the mass the most reliable of all accounts of these deplorable occurrences, several of them are to be received with caution, and remembrance of the fact, that the writers of them have been on intimate terms, nay, in close relations of intimacy and of confidence with the Druses, and had no sympathies with their adversaries of the Roman Catholic Church.

The art of ingeniously suffocating a subject of vast importance in a mass of official correspondence, has never been illustrated more clearly and cleverly too, than in the last production of "Correspondence Relating to the Affairs of Syria," presented to parliament in April, 1861. The correspondence dates from the 5th of July, 1860, to the 22nd of March 1861.

The International Commissioners, employed to inquire into the Syrian massacres, &c., at the latter date had nearly brought their labours to a close. It is really to be feared, however, they have settled nothing. The ends of justice have not been satisfied. The Druses remain unpunished, and no sufficient guarantee has been obtained from the Turkish Government for the protection and security of the Christian Maronites from renewed massacres.

The scheme of Government for the administration of affairs in Syria, drawn up by Lord Dufferin and proposed to his Government, is utterly impracticable; it has no executive principle in it. No adequate concessions have been obtained from the Porte for their maltreated Syrian subjects. No guarantees for good government have been exacted and made a *sine quâ non* of the withdrawal of the foreign force from Syria.

An admirable letter of Colonel Churchill, whose work entitled "Ten Years in the Lebanon," seven or eight years ago gave the best extant account of the modern Druses, appeared in *The London Examiner* of the 20th of April, 1861.

Sir,—The unanimous declaration of the survivors from the late massacres is, "the Government killed us." The bare idea of being left under the direct rule of the Ottoman Turks fills them with horror and despair. The voice of Christianity, of humanity, and civilisation demands, trumpet-tongued, that such direct rule should cease. Up to the present moment, the feelings of dread and insecurity, which have agitated the Christian population of Syria for these last ten months, remain unabated. In Damascus the Christians are still menaced and insulted. Crosses of wood are still made, thrown into the mire, and trampled upon. The few thousands who remained in that city during the past winter were preparing to abandon it. Already numerous families have arrived at Beyrout. Nothing can persuade them to remain.

In the Lebanon the Druses, encouraged by the strange impunity which has as yet attended their hideous atrocities, have assumed towards the unfortunate Christians still exposed to

their tender mercies a more menacing attitude than ever. They go about singing their war songs with an air of vindictive triumph, hold out threats of further slaughter, and tauntingly tell them, "we have kept all our plunder, and have trampled on your cross." The few families who ventured back to Hasbeya and Rascheya have been compelled to abandon them and have fled down to the coast. The Druses now openly wear the clothes of their victims. They go about armed up to the teeth. The Christians are hardly allowed to carry a knife. And, as before the war, the Druses and the Turkish soldiers quartered in the principal villages, live on terms of the closest friendship and alliance. Both look on the Christians with supercilious and ferocious scorn, as tyrants on their slaves. The French occupation, volunteered by the Emperor Napoleon, and sanctioned by the common consent of Europe, alone gave the Christians assurance, kept up their drooping spirits, and excited their hopes. To withdraw it ere they had a certainty of safety and security afforded them must be looked on as a moral crime. Justice and mercy alike proclaimed the imperious necessity of its continuance. In such a cause all national jealousies should cease. It was useless to limit it to three months, to six months, or to twelve. Its sacred mission was to save the Christian communities of Syria from impending dangers, to give them a form of Government, and to surround them with such guarantees as might enable them henceforth to live without hourly dread of assassination, of insult, and outrage, if not to flourish and prosper. When that mission was accomplished, and not till then, could the occupation cease, as it began, with honour."

Three plans have been propounded for such an administration in Syria, as might be reasonably expected to secure the advantages above mentioned. If the welfare of the whole province were to be considered, the plan ultimately adopted of Lord Dufferin and the European commissioners left much to be desired that would completely and efficiently answer all the purposes required.

The first propositions included a Mohammedan Governor-

General, approved of by the Christian Powers, who were to be represented by political agents accredited to the seat of Government, and empowered to co-operate in the general administration of the province; Abolition of the Feudal system; a national army of 25,000 men to be levied from all the various sects. Each sect to have its local Police force; a Christian Governor for the Lebanon, including Druses and Maronites, and other Christian sects residing within its limits.

Such were their leading features. The Christian communities, under such a regime, would be assured of consideration and protection. A loan of two millions sterling would be necessary to carry it into effect, for which the security of the revenues of the province would be amply sufficient. A European occupation of at least a year from the date of its inauguration would be necessary, during which the drilling and organization of the national army might be completed under the direction of European officers and non-commissioned officers. The better to effect this object, as it would strictly promote the design of the intervention, in the terms therein laid down, full efficiency should be immediately given to article 1 of the Protocol signed at Paris on the 3rd of August, 1860, which provided that—

A body of European troops which may be increased to 12,000 men, shall be sent to Syria, to contribute towards the establishment of tranquillity.

"It is clear (says Colonel Churçhill) there can be no tranquillity for the Christians in any true sense of the word, until such a government is established as will afford them good prospects of tranquillity for the future as well as for the present. Failing of achieving this end, the European occupation might as well never have taken place. To achieve it, not an hour short of one full year, as above mentioned will be sufficient. The effective French force in Syria under General Beaufort d'Hautpool is from 6,000 to 7,000 men. Let the requisite 12,000 men be completed by English troops. If not by English, by Prussian. All Turkish

troops should be at once withdrawn from the Pashalicks of Damascus and Sidon.

"If Fuad Pacha would frankly and cordially accept and act with the European element, civil, and military, thus introduced into the province, he might safely be made Governor-General and Commander-in-chief over Syria; for the two functions ought to be combined in his person. He is tolerant, fearless, laborious, energetic. Give him ample means, tell him to do the work, and he will do it. But he must be entirely free from all political connexion with Constantinople. Let him pay tribute no more. Any constrained subservience to that sink of fanaticism, corruption and intrigue, would be to render good government impossible. He would ere long throw up his hands in despair. If there exists no "arriére pensée" amongst the European Powers as to the future of Syria, if they really and sincerely wish for the welfare of its Christian races, and at the same time, to secure the integrity and independence of the Ottoman empire, let them go into this scheme at once and carry it out.

"Another plan is to create a Christian Principality of which Mount Lebanon should be the centre, with a seaboard, including the seaports of Tyre, Sidon, Beyrout, and Tripoli: and inland comprising the plains of Baalbec and the Bekan, with the Anti-Lebanon. The institutions and the local governors in the principality to be Christian, with a Christian military force of 8,000 men. The governor to be an Emir of the family of Shehaab. The Christians in other parts of Syria, if dissatisfied with their position, to congregate here as to a common asylum. Damascus to be left entirely to the Mohammedans. The plan is worthy of consideration. It certainly holds out good prospects for the Christians. With rights and privileges guaranteed to them by the European Powers, they would quickly exhibit a healthful commercial activity; towns now in ruins would be rebuilt, roads and canals would be made, their condition, to use the well-known but hitherto futile and unmeaning phrase, "would be ameliorated."

To this plan it has been objected that it would be simply creating a French province, "un département du Haut Leban." The objection is not altogether groundless. A Maronite Emir, whatever may be his outward professions, indeed however good his intentions, must fall more or less, from his birth, from his education, and from his associations, under the influence of the Maronite priesthood. The latter are notoriously the great promoters of French influence and French views, political and ecclesiastical, and whenever their advice and councils are adopted by the civil power, a grasping and bigoted intolerance is sure to make itself felt in all parts of the administration, and a stern resistance to that freedom of thought and action which is so essential to the formation and existence of a happy and well-regulated community. Should this plan excite the jealousy of England, and not unnaturally, while it has attractions for France, let the latter, if she is really disinterested in her views, consent to the governor of such principality being a European and a Protestant, holding his investiture, his rank, and his office, from the Sultan. The sphere of government being more circumscribed, the military force to be organized so much smaller, the European occupation under this project would not need to be extended to more than half a year instead of one.

Whether either the one or the other of these plans be adopted, or whatever modifications may be introduced, the broad principle of taking the Christian races from under the yoke of the Ottoman Turks must indispensably be adhered to. The Porte is lavishly profuse in promises during the hour of need, but experience has too often and too sadly proved the utter illusion of ever expecting their fulfilment. To anticipate that it will ever utilize the Christian element, or ever give it fair play, or ever "ameliorate the condition of the Christians" in the European sense of that word, is a chimera and a dream. Such objects can only be obtained by placing the Christians in such a position that they may be free from the overbearing dictation and corrupting influences of Turkish authorities on

the one hand, and from the constant necessity of European intervention and protection on the other.

With good institutions and a defined basis for social improvement, the latter fruitful source of irritation and jealousy to the Porte, and which so far from being attended with any lasting practical benefit, has been the main source of all the recent calamities to the Christians, might altogether cease. Then the Ottoman Empire might with some truth boast of its independence, whilst its integrity would be strictly preserved. In a word, let the European Powers now interfere, once for all, on behalf of the Christians of Syria, resolutely, unitedly, and effectively, and then leave them to themselves.

The third plan emanates from Constantinople, and needs only to be noticed for its wild absurdity. Syria is to be divided into two Pashalicks instead of four. Each of the two new Pashas to be advised by a Municipal Council, in which a few Christians shall sit as members; in other words, a Municipal Council composed of fanatical Mohammedans and Christian mutes, forced to remain helpless spectators of every species of wrong and injustice to their co-religionists. With four Pashas, some chance existed of one perhaps being not quite so bad as his colleagues. With two, even this chance would be reduced to its minimum. The sword of Damocles would hang over the Christians by a slenderer thread than ever!

I am, &c.,

C. H. CHURCHILL.

April, 1860.

A writer in the *British Quarterly Review* on the massacres in Syria, well acquainted with his subject, observes:—

"With the facts we have referred to, before him, no man will be at a loss to discover the true source of Syria's miseries, and real origin and cause of the recent massacres. Islâm is at the root of the whole. Its spirit, foul and fierce, animates alike its stranger rulers and the great body of its native population. It

will permit no change, it will tolerate no reform. It will exercise unlimited, irresponsible control over the properties and lives of all subject to its sway, or it will exterminate them. It will use all agencies, it will take advantage of all circumstances, and will employ all means to effect its purposes. It allows no feelings of gratitude, honour, or humanity to restrain or set aside its designs. It is the determined and deadly enemy of civil and religious liberty. So long, therefore, as Islâm is paramount in Syria, the case of the country is hopeless, because reform is impossible. Islâm has hitherto opposed every theory of reform forced upon the attention and acceptance of the Turkish Government; and it has effectually prevented the reduction of any accepted theory into practice. The language used by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in a recent speech in the House of Lords, is striking and most important: 'It is true the Sultan has accepted, and has even proclaimed to his people, a system of reform, which, if it had been properly carried out, might have prevented these disasters, and probably would have done so, and placed the empire on a totally different footing from what it is now on. Indeed, I must say with confidence, that had this been so, the empire would have been in a much better condition than at the present moment,—a condition of which the disasters which have occurred in Syria exhibit so prominent and striking an example. It must occur to your Lordships, as well as to myself, that a heavy responsibility rests upon the Porte, in consequence of this state of things. If we look into the question of Syria, it is impossible not to observe, in immediate connection with it, that the great Eastern question is involved; and I don't hesitate to say that that question is at this moment absolutely brought home to our doors by what has occurred in Syria. You will in vain put down what has taken place there; in vain you will staunch the blood which has flowed; in vain you will take measures to prevent the renewal of those atrocities, unless you find the means of engaging the Turkish Government to redeem their pledges, and give effectual execution to those reforms which have been

so often urged upon them. Unless that is done, it is my firm conviction that you will only patch up the difficulty for the moment; and you will leave the seeds of fresh disturbances and fresh difficulties of a still more disastrous and dangerous character.

There was one brief period in modern times, during which Syria visibly revived, and appeared to give fair promise of future prosperity. That was during the rule of Mohammed Ali. His rule was stern, in many cases severe, and in some instances perhaps cruel; but it was effectual. In the eight short years of his power, notwithstanding all the opposition he encountered from Turkey, he reduced the various warlike tribes to almost complete subjection, and to a great extent disarmed them. He rendered life and property everywhere secure. He gave a blow to Muslem fanaticism, from the effects of which it never revived until within the last few months. He compelled several of the wandering tribes of the desert to settle down into peaceful cultivators of the soil, and he made them all tremble at his name. He opened a wide door for the influx of European industry, commerce, and civilisation. Mohammed Ali was nominally a Moslem; but his whole policy tended gradually to set aside the spirit and principles of Islâm from the civil government of the country.

Taking all these facts and circumstances into consideration, we believe that Syria requires, for its permanent pacification and future prosperity, a separate government, somewhat similar to that of Egypt. Should it be found impossible to obtain the Porte's consent to an independent government, its ruler might acknowledge the suzerainty of the Sultan, and pay a fixed tribute; yet he ought to possess independent administrative power, and an army of his own. His independence, in this sense, ought to be guaranteed by the European powers; and a mixed commission might be appointed to aid in the devising and carrying out of needed reforms. The resources of the country are amply sufficient to maintain such a government; they only require development. Both soil and climate are well

adapted for the production of silk, cotton, olive-oil, and wine, in addition to an abundant supply of grain. The population contain in themselves the elements of industrial and political greatness. The Western Powers have now a fair opportunity of making a noble experiment; and it is to be hoped that mutual jealousies and fears will not be permitted to interfere. There are surely enough of inducements to this work, altogether apart from the gratification of petty national vanity, or the gaining of mere territorial aggrandizement. There is the preservation of the most interesting country in the world from utter ruin, the salvation of half a million of human beings from massacre or exile, and the relieving of Europe from the almost certain prospect of a general war. Prompted by a pure desire to accomplish such great and good objects, let our own country faithfully discharge her Eastern mission."

These are words of true wisdom—worthy of being spoken by a true Englishman, mindful of the eternal interests of truth and justice, and faithful to them, heedless of the fallacies and sophisms of statesmen and politicians, of their scribes and supporters in clubs and cliques of all sects and factions.

CHAPTER XIII.

Observations on the latest official correspondence relating to disturbances in Syria. Withdrawal of French troops and labours of International Commission.

THE last Blue Book—"Relating to the affairs of Syria," was presented to Parliament in April, 1861. The printed matter extends to 517 pages of a portly folio volume. I have elsewhere had occasion to observe that a vast volume of a blue book was a grand illustration of the art of ingeniously suffocating a troublesome subject, in a mass of words sufficient to overlay all facts of importance in it. The volume I refer to is a fine specimen of that ingenious art.

To disengage the facts that are of importance in the volume from the mass of consular twaddle and diplomatic verbiage, from all the sophistry, glaring inconsistency, prejudice, misapprehension and mis-representation that surround them, is a work of no small labour. I have made very copious extracts from this volume, it now only remains for me concisely and distinctly to set before my readers the important truths we arrive at, after a very careful examination and a painstaking study of this volume.

The British consuls of Syria believe that the imperial interests of England are bound up with the missionary interests of the several Bible Societies, whose agents are established in Syria. They imbibe the polemics of the missionaries, and they adapt their politics to them. Of all the Syrian races, the English

missionaries meet with most opposition, at the hands of the Maronites. The Christians of this sect, who are called Maronites, will not be converted by the Christians of the other sect, who are called Protestants. Ergo, the former are in bad odour with the latter. But the heathen sect of the Druses have been at deadly enmity with the Maronites for the last twenty years, and for thirty-four years at variance with them to my knowledge (since 1827); therefore the Druses are patronized, petted, favoured, and commended by the missionaries, to the same extent that the Maronite Christians are reprobated, disliked, disparaged, run down, and written down, with all the zeal of exasperated theology by them.

Our consuls in Syria unfortunately, instead of minding their business, which I take it, is in relation to all matters that affect the material and political interests of their country, its commerce and affairs of state, think their first duty is to espouse the quarrels of the English missionaries with the Maronite Christians; and accordingly they pester their government with polemical views of English political interests in Syria; and everything that is Catholic in the constitution of the Maronite religion and sect, is a dangerous French element in their opinion, one that is naturally adverse to everything truly Protestant and British.

Ever and anon, this almost incredible view of consular duties on the part of the minor diplomatic agents of a great commercial nation brings us to the verge of a war, calls for the intervention of our ambassador at the Porte, overwhelms the home government with official correspondence about the contentions of sects and races in the Levant, pesters the Foreign Office with consular squabbles about rival missionary establishments in Syria, and sees nothing in their polemics but great interests of state, a question of the maintenance of English influence in the Turkish dominions, involved in those miserable disputes. Throughout all the districts of the Lebanon the danger of the ascendancy of French influence is thus made to appear imminent and formidable. Caligula is treated with too much

severity by historians for making a consul of his horse, he might have done worse—conferred the consular dignity on asses.

The ponderous official tome I have referred to, laid before Parliament in April 1860, informs us, that in virtue of a treaty between the five great powers, a French Army of about 6,000 men was despatched to Syria for the protection of the Christians of that country, in July, 1860. We are likewise informed that an inter-national commission consisting of five members (a representative of each of the great European powers) was appointed to proceed to Syria, with a view to the adoption in concert with the commissioner of the Porte, Fuad Pasha, of permanent measures of pacification, the adoption of the most prompt means of obtaining the satisfaction due to humanity for the outrages committed on humanity. We find in the instructions of Lord John Russell to Lord Dufferin, the most explicit directions to his Lordship. It would be his duty, he was told, "to inquire in concert with the other Commissioners into the origin and causes of the late deplorable events, to determine the share of responsibility incurred by the Chiefs of the insurrections and the agents of the administration, and to call for the punishment of the guilty." And Lord John Russell goes on to say there can be no doubt "the inquiry which he (Lord Dufferin) will conduct in concert with the Turkish Commissioner will have for its result the execution of severe and impartial justice with regard to the Chiefs as well as the subordinate instruments of crime." Nothing can be plainer than those instructions.

Have they been carried into effect? I am sorry to say they have not. Lord Dufferin's mission has been a failure. With the best disposition and most sincere desire to do his duty, he has failed to carry out one of the important instructions given by Lord John Russell with respect to the execution of severe and impartial justice on the "Chiefs of the insurrection" as the Druse murderers of the Maronite Christians are termed by Lord John Russell. In justice to that

noble Lord, it must be stated that nothing can be stronger than the language he employed, or more peremptory than the instructions he issued, in reference to the atrocities committed by the Druses, and the necessity of punishing adequately the perpetrators of them.

How is it, then, that not one of those Druse chiefs has been made to pay the penalty of their crimes? How has it happened that of all of those Druse chiefs brought to trial by Fuad Pacha, of whose guilt the official documents furnished by the Tribunal by which they were tried to the five European Commissioners, and printed in the parliamentary papers relating to the Syrian massacres lately published, can leave no doubt, who were found guilty by that Tribunal and sentenced to death, not a single one has been executed?

The answer is very simple, because Lord Dufferin's active intervention with Fuad Pacha, his Lordship's strenuous and unceasing efforts in behalf of the condemned, prevented the Turkish Commissioner from carrying into effect the execution of the sentences that had been pronounced on the Druses. Then one of the chief objects for which this international commission had been appointed—namely, the satisfaction of justice has utterly failed.

The failure, indeed, lies at the door of the leading member of this commission, who, though animated, as I have said before, by the best intentions, and no less estimable for his private virtues than for his mild, amiable, and conciliatory disposition, was nevertheless unqualified for the post to which he was appointed, and the very arduous and stern duties he would be called on to perform.

Lord Dufferin's infirmity of purpose, incapacity for action on his own judgment, deficiency of mental power and decision of character to enable him to come to right conclusions, and to adhere to them inflexibly, rendered him incompetent to fulfil the duties of his office, or to bring to the discharge of them the necessary requirements of firmness, self-reliance, and

distrust of the counsels, views, ,and opinions of the local authorities, and of consular and missionary influences.

The result was singular inconsistency in the whole course of Lord Dufferin's career as a commissioner, at one time at Damascus inciting Fuad Pacha to prompt and severe measures against the Mussulmen inhabitants of Damascus, bitterly complaining of his tardy proceedings, and at another period inveighing against the summary proceedings adopted by him against the Druses, finding fault with the rules of evidence on which the Druses were convicted and solemnly protesting against the execution of them on such evidence, and especially urging his intervention on behalf of the chief culprit of the Druses—Said Bey Djemblat.

By the same tribunal thirty-two Druses implicated in the massacres not having been arrested, were judged, condemned, "par contumace," and sentenced to death, but no effective measures were taken by the Turkish authorities for their arrest and when a small body of the French troops was allowed by Fuad Pacha to accompany the Turkish soldiers to the Lebanon with a view to the arrest of the guilty parties, Lord Dufferin remonstrated with Fuad Pacha against French soldiers being allowed to take any part in his military proceedings.

The views of our Consuls in Syria, adopted by our Minister at the Porte, have created for us a conventional diplomatic opinion of "The Eastern Question," which we receive with an implicit faith in its truth and justice. If ever there was a time when the ground on which it rested should have been closely examined, it was when the recent massacres of the Maronite Christians at the hands of the Druses and the Turks took place in Syria, and certainly upwards of eight thousand human beings, professing the Christian faith, were put to the sword, seventy five thousand persons put to flight, and of these twenty five thousand wretched fugitives, the wives and orphans of murdered Christians, were thrown on the wide world without house or home, food or raiment.

Lord Dufferin unfortunately delivered up his judgment to the Consular and Missionary influences of which I have spoken. He allowed his mind to be warped by them. He became exceedingly prejudiced against the great body of the Christian population of Syria—of the Maronites, he formed the most erroneous views of their character and qualities, their religion, and their priests and prelates. He vilified, and I am sorry to say he misrepresented—unintentionally, I am bound to believe—the Maronite bishops, in a most extraordinary dispatch of his to Lord John Russell, dated March 23, 1861 (see Blue Book, published in April, 1861, page 513), where he charges them most unjustly with seeking at the hands of Fuad Pacha the extermination of a large number of the Druse population of no less than 4310 Druses of the Lebanon. Let us see what those prelates have to say to this egregious imputation on their character and their religion.

Letter from the Catholic Bishops of the Lebanon to the International Commission in Syria, in reply to certain accusations brought against them in the British parliament:—

Beyrout, March 15.—It was with affliction and grief that we read in the *Independence Belge*, of the 11th of February, the article of which a copy is hereto annexed. If this article, based on declarations made in the House of Commons by Lord John Russell, in the sitting of the 8th of February, concerned only ourselves, we should not have taken the trouble of refuting it; but it concerns the Christian populations, whom it is attempted to represent as unworthy of the sympathies which their calamities have procured them on the part of the Sultan's government and of the great European Powers who have so generously hastened to their relief. It is, therefore, a bounden duty for us to re-establish the facts, and we are encouraged by so doing by the conviction that we shall not appeal in vain to the reminiscences of his Excellency Fuad Pasha, to the good faith of Lord Dufferin, whose thought must have been imperfectly interpreted, and to the sentiments of justice of the representatives of the European Powers.

When his Excellency Fuad Pasha was about to undertake the repression of the Druses he called around him six Christian bishops and requested them to name such of the more notable Christians, conscientious men and well acquainted with passing events, as might be able to give him information respecting the guilty parties. The bishops replied that the functions with which they were invested forbade them taking any part in a question which belonged exclusively to the judicial authorities. Fuad Pasha admitted the justice of that observation, and explained that he did not wish them to act in a judicial capacity, but simply to give him the names of persons on whose information he could depend. The bishops then gave the names of 16 most respectable Christians, all laymen, who were charged by his Excellency to supply the information he wanted, and who all engaged on oath to say nothing but the truth. Some days after these notables handed to his Excellency a list containing the names of 4,600 Druses, Mussulmans, and Metualis, living in the Lebanon, the Anti-Lebanon, and the Hauran, and chosen from among 30,000 combatants, and not from among only 8,000 Druses, as it is pretended, at the same time indicating the nature of the crimes imputed to each of the persons included in the list.

His Excellency again summoned the bishops to his presence to inform them that he well knew all the Druses to be guilty, but that the number given was too great, and that it was necessary to select only the most guilty. The bishops replied that they had no knowledge either of the list or the persons mentioned in it, and that, owing to their character, it did not become them to take any part in the affair. But the 16 Christian notables, when again consulted by Fuad Pasha, replied that the list they had drawn up by his orders was only intended as information to enlighten justice, and that neither they nor the Christian population would think of demanding that the repression should affect so great a number of victims. However, at the demand of his Excellency, they then reduced the list to 1,200 of those most compromised, leaving the judicial

authorities to ascertain their guilt, and the government to fix the extent and number of the punishments.

The bishops have, therefore, had nothing to do with the repression alluded to, and the notables only undertook to supply his Excellency with the information he needed for his guidance. As for the document mentioned in the House of Commons, the undersigned bishops declare that they never signed any such paper, and that it would be utterly impossible to produce anything of the kind.

Such are the facts. In recalling them to the memory of the Commission, the undersigned bishops venture to request its members, in the name of the Christians against whom this strange calumny has been raised, in order to deprive them of the sympathy of civilized nations, to communicate this declaration to their respective governments, and to publish it, so that the interest of which the Syrians are the object may not be diminished by the thought that they have shown themselves unworthy of it.

Tobias Aoun, Bishop of Beyrout.
Bouthros Bostany, Bishop of St. Jean d'Acre.
Basil Chahiat, Bishop of Zahleh and Belka.
Matathios, Bishop of Baalbeck and dependencies.

The Maronite Bishop of Beirout Tobias, on whom Lord Dufferin is particularly severe in several very inconsiderate assaults on the Maronite community in his despatches, is a virtuous, pious, and a peaceably-disposed Christian prelate, of whom Lord Dufferin in point of charity, benignty, and fair dealing towards his fellow men of all religious persuasions, in his condescension, might stoop to learn much that would be useful to his lordship, and of no disservice to his mission.

When I say this, I admit, or rather I avow, that I am aware, when this Bishop of Beirout became acquainted with the fact of the existence of a Turkish conspiracy against the Christians of Syria had been organised in Constantinople, and that the Druses had given in their adhesion to the project, and were making open preparations for a projected massacre of the Ma-

ronites, he advised the leading people of his community to be prepared for the coming tempest of fanaticism, and in a condition to defend themselves, their homes and altars, wives and families. Had his advice been taken, 8,000 lives of his flock might have been spared, and twenty-five thousand fugitives saved from a fate not less disastrous.

Lord Dufferin has adopted, to the fullest extent, the Consular and Missionary prejudices against the Maronite community. In his despatches, on several occasions, he speaks of them as savage and sanguinary, a besotted, ignorant people, having scarcely anything but the name of Christian belonging to their community. Lord Dufferin is an Irish Protestant dilettanti traveller in the East; he visited Syria a short time previouly to the late massacres, and he saw the people of that country through the eyes of the obsequious consuls and urbane missionaries always attentive, civil, courteous, and serviceable in their several spheres of utility to a Lord. But Lord Dufferin knew nothing of the Maronites or their priests or prelates of his own knowledge. I think I know them well; I have lived amongst them and with them on terms of close intimacy, and I have no hesitation in saying they have been as much misrepresented by Lord Dufferin (if the despatches purporting to be written by him, and published in the last blue book relative to the Syrian disturbances, are true and faithful expressions of his opinions) as it is possible to conceive the powers of misrepresentation to go. The Maronites are a thrifty, industrious, honest, kindly disposed people, strongly attached to their religion, by no means fanatical, savage or sanguinary. That is my estimate of their character.

But the great object of all of the international commission was professed to have been to consider and devise the best means of securing for the Rayahs of Syria, a strong government capable of protecting them from future massacres and spoliation and aggression either at the hands of Turkish authorities or Druses. The commission is now virtually at an end. We have insisted on the withdrawal of French troops. Lord Dufferin proposed a

scheme of government for Syria (quite inadequate for the objects contemplated, and impracticable as I believe) which was rejected by the Porte. The Porte propounded a plan of its own, remarkable only for the audacity of its effrontery, in the face of Europe, attempting, as it does, to impose on the credulity of Christendom—a plan entirely nugatory, incapable of affording the slightest protection to its Christian subjects in Syria, and evidently and obviously not intended to accomplish any such object. That plan has been modified and accepted. Such is the state of things in the East; all our conventions are virtually of no effect, nothing permanently good has been accomplished, and everything that led to disturbance has been left unsettled by the commission, that is come or coming to an end, and the temporary occupation of a corner of Syria by French troops, where it has been sedulously kept in a state of inactivity, and from which we have insisted on its withdrawal on the 1st of June, 1861.

Our efforts on two occasions on behalf of the Turks have been crowned with such entire success, that we were enabled to deliver over to the tender mercies of the Turks, at one period, the Druses who had been, up to the period of Ibraham Pacha's invasion of Syria, virtually independent of the Turks; and, at another time, likewise the Maronites, whose independence had existed for centuries previous to the occupation of the Egyptians.

Mohammed Ali, on pretence of avenging wrongs done him by Abdullah Pacha, the governor of St. Jean D'Acre, sent an army into Syria under his son, Ibraham Pacha, of from 40 to 50,000 men, in 1832. From Acre to Damascus the country, in a short time, was in the hands of the Egyptians. A Turkish army was routed, and a little later another army of 20,000 men defeated, near Aleppo, a third Turkish army, under Nusem Pacha, of 36,000 men in the course of a few months, was still more signally beaten. At the beginning of August, 1832, all Syria was in the possession of Ibraham Pacha and his Egyptian army. At the end of December, same year, another

Turkish army of 60,000 men, under the Grand Vizier, was likewise worsted by Ibraham Pacha. In February, 1833, the panic-stricken Sultan had recourse to his great enemy, the Emperor of Russia, for protection against the Egyptians, who now threatened a descent on Constantinople, and a Russian army was kindly landed at Scutari to form a barrier against the further advance of the Egyptian forces. Efforts to obtain peace with the Egyptian Viceroy on the part of the Sultan were made, and after long negotiations the arrangement of Kutaieh was concluded, which, however, had not all the official formalities of an actual treaty, in virtue of which arrangement the whole of Syria was ceded to the Pacha, together with Adana. From 1833 to 1838 the arrangement entered into at Kutaieh continued in force. Syria was, in fact, an Egyptian province. In 1838 the Viceroy of Egypt took the first step towards his violation of the agreement by declining in future to pay any tribute to the Porte, and thus virtually asserting his independence. In the early part of 1839 the Sultan managed to raise and equip a large army to reduce his rebellious Viceroy, and accordingly assembled his forces on the eastern side of the Euphrates with the view of attacking opportunely Ibraham Pacha's Syrian forces. France and England interfered at this juncture to keep the Turkish and Egyptian armies from coming to an engagement, lest Russian interference should again be required. The Viceroy of Egypt gave an assurance to the consuls general of France and England to the effect that if the hereditary government of his territories was secured to him and to his descendants, he would withdraw a portion of his troops and conclude a formal and definitive arrangement with the Sultan.

No account was taken by the Porte of the proposals of the Viceroy. A manifesto was promulgated at Constantinople, by which the Viceroy of Egypt, and his son Ibraham Pacha were deprived of all the dignities and offices.

The famous battle of Nezib was fought on the 24th of June, 1839, in which the Sultan's forces were completely routed, and

all the Turkish stores and munitions of war, 104 pieces of cannon and 15,000 muskets were left in the hands of the victorious Egyptian general. The tidings of this great disaster never reached Sultan Mohammed the 2nd, he died on the 1st of July, 1839. In the middle of the same month the whole Ottoman fleet was traitorously delivered up to the Viceroy of Egypt.

Mohammed Ali was now in a position, he thought, to propose rather exorbitant terms to the new Sultan. He offered peace, but he demanded as the price of it that the hereditary sovereignty of Egypt, Syria, and Candia should be conferred on him. And on this condition he pledged himself to become the faithful subject and sure ally of the Sultan, and in all emergencies to defend him and his Empire. These proposals were on the point of being accepted, when England, France, Russia, Prussia, and Austria, the five great powers, stepped into the field of Mussulman contention, and undertook the settlement of the Eastern question. At the commencemcnt of 1840, before the settlement was agreed on that was to be fatal to the ambitious designs of Mohammed Ali, he had in Syria under his son Ibraham 70,000 regular troops and 50,000 irregular bands and Bedouin Arabs, and on board the fleet 36,000 men ready for either service on land or sea.

About the middle of 1840 the settlement of the eastern question by the five powers was arrived at, and "the Brunow Convention" embodying, it was signed in London. By this convention it was agreed the following ultimatum should be announced to Mohammed Ali. That the hereditary sovereignty of Egypt should be secured to his family, and the Pachalik of St. Jean D'Acre possessed by himself for life, and that if he refused to accept these terms in ten days, the Sultan would offer him Egypt only, and if he still persisted in refusing, the contracting powers would force him to agree to these terms. The terms were virtually refused under the form of repeated efforts to gain time, and vague avowals of pacific intentions. At length the port of Alexandria and the ports of Syria were

placed under strict blockade by the Allied fleets. Beirout and Sidon were taken by an armed force of the Allies in Sept., 1840, and on the 10th of Oct. an engagement took place between the allied forces and those of Egypt, in which the latter were wholly discomfited. St. Jean D'Acre soon after was taken by Admiral Stopford and Commodore Napier.

Early in January, 1841, Commodore Napier proposed definitive terms of peace to Mohammed Ali which were accepted by him—on condition of having the hereditary government of Egypt conferred upon him, he consented to restore the Sultan's fleet and to recall his son Ibrahim, and the Egyptian army from Syria.

Thus passed away the dream of Mohammed Ali's ambition —of his sovereignty in Syria and Palestine.

Our unaccountable and inconsistent policy led to the evacuation of Syria by the Egyptians. That government with all its systematic rapacity was (for a Mohammedan Government) a strong, tolerant, and generally speaking, an enlightened government. The recent massacres of the Christians by the Druses never could have been perpetrated while Syria was under an Egyptian Government.

The Maronites are indebted to that unfortunate policy for all their recent sufferings and terrible loss of life and property.

In 1840, when our successful efforts against Mohammed Ali led to the expulsion of his army from Syria to the ruin and expatriation of the Emir Bechir, the astute Prince of an india rubber conscience at once a Druse and a Christian, who united in his rule the Supreme Government of the Maronite and Druses. Up to the time of the Egyptian invasion in 1832, the Lebanon was in a state of *quasi* independence, exempt from the immediate jurisdiction of the Turkish authority of the adjacent Pachaliks. The Maronite and Druse inhabitants of the Lebanon were governed by a common ruler—the Emir Bechir—a Druse prince of great power and influence, who, about 1827 or 1828, secretly adopted the Roman Catholic religion. The Emir ruled his subjects with a strong hand; he was a bold, unscrupulous

man of a firm will, capable of acts of great savagery when his enemies fell into his power, as the ill-fated Sheik Bechir's family had terrible experience of in their own persons. While the Emir Bechir governed the mountain, the little jealousies, one might say natural antipathies, that existed between the Christian Maronites and Pagan Druses were never suffered to break out into those fierce explosions of rancorous hostility which from the period of his downfall and removal at the departure from Syria of Ibrahim Pacha became frequent and of periodical recurrence.

In 1838, the Druses of the Hauran revolted against Ibrahim Pacha, who, with an army of 40,000 men, was unable to subdue a horde of insurgent Druses not exceeding 3,000, commanded by Chebli-el-Harian. Ibrahim, after having lost nearly fifteen thousand of his best troops, found it necessary to have recourse to new means of effecting the subjection of the insurgent Druses. He determined on opposing the Christian Maronites to the Druses, Montagnard, like the latter, and accustomed to the mode of warfare of mountaineers. Ibrahim entered into communication with the Emir Bechir, who promised secretly to obtain for him the support of the Maronites, and to exercise his influence over the Druses in favour of the Pacha, on condition of Ibrahim supplying the Maronite chief, the Emir Medjid, with armies and munitions of war. Ibrahim immediately caused 7,000 muskets to be distributed to the Maronites, in concert with the Emir Medjid, for the special purpose of the Christians combatting the insurgent Druses. This fact is well deserving of attention, particularly that of Lord Dufferin, who appears to have been in utter ignorance of it, when he stated in one of his dispatches to Lord John Russell, that the late massacres of the Christians on the part of the Druses, was only a phase of the active hostility that has been for ages a normal state of things, one of furious animosity suddenly and spontaneously, or accidentally kindled into warfare between these deadly enemies, equally savage, fanatical, and sanguinary, the Maronites and Druses.

Now, here, in 1838, we have the origin of those fierce conflicts

between the two races breaking out into open warfare or massacre on a large scale, in the successful efforts of the Mosiem Prince Ibrahim Pacha, to set the Maronites and the Druses by the ears, arming the Christians against the Pagans, both adversaries of the faith of Islam, and enemies of the Turkish dominion.

This occurred in July, 1838, and before the end of the month, the arming of the Maronites and the bringing of them into action against the Druses, enabled Ibrahim Pacha to bring the Druses into subjection, and to deprive them of their independence.

The Viceroy of Egypt, in recognition of the services of the Maronites to his son, sent them a present of 24,000 muskets, "for them, their children and the children of their children." And in further evidence of his gratitude, he promised for the future, that the two taxes imposed on Christian Rayahs—the *Meri* and the *Ferdi*—should not exceed the amount at which these imposts were fixed in the time of the Sultan, Mahmoud the 2nd.

But when the Maronites had served the purpose of Ibrahim Pacha, these promises of his father were broken. He levied contributions on them which far exceeded any ever imposed on them by the Turkish Government. And when they grumbled and resisted the levies made by his officials, he deprived them of the arms his father had given "for them and their children, and the children of their children." The Emir Bechir was made the instrument of this enormous oppression and rapacity of Ibrahim Pacha in all the districts of the Lebanon.

So the Maronites, in 1840, in their turn were disarmed, and like the Druses were deprived of their independence. And then a community of misfortunes re-united the two widely separated sects. The Druses and the Maronites now held assemblies of the Chiefs of each community, and discussed projects of resistance to their Egyptian oppressors, and the result was a new revolt in the Lebanon on the part of the combined sects. Then followed the bombardment of Beyrout, Sidon, Caipha, Tripoli,

and St. Jean D'Acre by the Allied Powers, the retreat of the Egyptian army from Syria, and the occupation of several places on the coast by English forces.

Of this state of things, and all the confusion it led to, the Druses took advantage in the month of September, 1841, and made a massacre, on a moderately small scale, of the Maronites of Deir-el-Kammar. This was the first fruits of our efforts in behalf of Turkish dominion in Syria—the result of the first establishment of Turkish jurisdiction in the Lebanon. From this time, to 1845, the Druses were continually in a state of preparation for war against the Christians of the Lebanon, or actually engaged in it.

With respect to the last massacre of Syrian Christians in 1860, various estimates of the number slain have been given. Of the numerous productions that have appeared in France since the commencement of 1860 on the subject of the Syrian massacres, the one I have above referred to, entitled "Les Evenemens de la Syrie," by the Comte Melchior de Vogue, is particularly worthy of attention for the accuracy of its information, and the evident desire that is manifested in it to state facts and not feelings and impressions. Before I saw this work, I was struck with the smallness of the estimate made by Mr. Graham, and followed by Mr. Consul-General Moore in the account given of the numbers massacred at Hasbeya and Rasheya, they estimate the number at 700. Mons. de Vogue, states, and I believe his statement is much nearer the truth than that of Messrs. Graham and Moore, that the numbers slain at both places were 2,500: at Hasbeya 1,200, and at Rasheya 1,300. This was a joint carnage at the hands of Turkish soldiers and Druses. The unfortunate Maronites were the victims of that perfidy which is such a peculiar characteristic of the Turkish race. They persuaded the Christians of both towns to surrender their arms, and when they were defenceless, they were butchered in cold blood.

The author of "Les Maronites en France," (Par. 1860. p. 16), says, "on the authority of a missionary of high character, there

were 3,000 men massacred at Deir-el-Kammar." Consul-General Moore and Mr. Graham, estimated the number slain there considerably less.

And on the same authority, he says, "The Druses declare that the number of Christians they massacred in the Lebanon amounted to 22,000. The Christians believe the number was only 15,000." I believe it did not exceed 10,000; of this number 8,000 were slain, and 2,000 died of their wounds. Of the 75,000 Christian fugitives from their homes, prior to or pending the outrages of the Druses, I find little difference in the various statements of the number of widows and orphans, which is estimated at 25,000.

Even under the new system of government adopted for the Lebanon, I do not believe there is any probability of permanent security for the Christian inhabitants, not even for a single year.

Most assuredly, till such time as the people of the Lebanon, of all sects and races, are rescued from their present state of subjection to Turkish rapacity, oppression, and misgovernment; till a new form of separate and independent government is given to them adequate to the wants, and sufficient for the interests of these communities, there is no guarantee for their protection.

Till this state of security for the Christians of the Lebanon shall have been obtained by our demands on Turkey, and bonâ fide intervention at the Porte for the attainment of that object, there is no security for the peace of Europe.

CHAPTER XIV.

Death of Sultan Abdul Medjid and Accession of his Brother Abdul Azis.—Latest Financial Statistics of Turkey.

DISPATCHES from Constantinople, dated 22nd of June, 1861, announced the definitive appointment of Davoud Effendi as Governor of the Lebanon. He was on that day invested as Governor of the Lebanon, with the rank of Mudir, and full powers, and was to proceed immediately to his post.

The last and befitting act of benevolence of the amiable Sultan, Abdul Medjid, and latest public act of his life, was the appointment of a Governor of the Lebanon, invested with full powers to protect the Christians of that region, and to restrain the ferocity of their sanguinary opponents.

And the successor of that most humane, mild, and tolerant of Ottoman sovereigns, is the fanatic brother of his, named Abdul Azis, the identical Prince whom the Mussulman fanatics of Constantinople, a few months ago, claimed as their partisan and found the defender of the Turkish functionaries, who so lately had aided and abetted the conspiracy concocted in Constantinople, against the lives of the Christians in Syria and other provinces of the Turkish Empire, that was carried into effect so successfully in the Lebanon by the Druses and the Turkish troops at the disposal of the principal Pachas in those regions that were the theatres of the late atrocities.

The English papers of the 26th of June, in which only four

days previously, the appointment of the Governor of the Lebanon by Sultan Abdul Medjid, had been announced, contain accounts of the death of the latter, the son of the great reforming Sultan, Mahmoud the 2nd.

Valide-Sultana, the mother of the late Sultan, originally a Georgian Christian slave given to Sultan Mahmoud II., had only one child, Abdul Medjid. The Sultana was greatly loved by Mahmoud. She was remarkable for her amiability of disposition and benevolence of character, no less than for her personal advantages.

But though Abdul Medjid was the only son of his mother, he was the twenty-first son of Sultan Mahmoud.

Abdul Medjid, born the 23rd of April, 1823, thirty-first sovereign of the dynasty of Othman, succeeded his father, Mahmoud II., in his 17th year, on the 1st July, 1839.

The new Sultan was a frail youth, prematurely exhausted, of feeble health and enervated energies. He came to the throne when the State was involved in difficulties and dangers of a most formidable character. Mehemet Ali, the Viceroy of Egypt had revolted, and even menaced Constantinople and Turkey with invasion. The Emperor of Russia, Nicholas, had embarrassed the Porte with importunate proffers of protection. The Janissary Institution was defunct, but the old spirit of fanaticism was kept alive by the Ulemas and Dervishes, and the old fierce hatred of reforms in the State which smouldered during the latter years of Mahmoud, was ready to be kindled into a new flame of tumult and commotion, by the rabble and the partisans of the old order of things, who made use of the turbulence of the lower orders of the capital. These difficulties were pondered over in the Seraglio before the breath was yet out of the body of Sultan Mahmoud, by Khosrew Pacha, Halil, and Said Pacha, and the two Chamberlains, Izzet and Riza.

Khosrew Pacha, a veteran minister, inured to the struggles of oriental politics, where people often have to fight not only for power, but even for life, was a sort of Turkish Talleyrand—

lame, like the French diplomatist, false and versatile like him, and like him ready to serve all ideas and all parties. He had resolved a very difficult problem, that of sharing, during fifty years, in all the intrigues of the Divan, without leaving his head behind him. Halil was the son-in-law of the Sultan Mahmoud, and the adopted son of Khosrew; nevertheless, a jealousy existed between them, although for the time-being their projects worked together well enough.

The violent explosion that was expected to have taken place on the occasion of the funeral of the deceased Sultan was prevented by timely precautions; a few private executions took place, and the discontented were aware that Husein Pacha, the man who had executed the vengeance of Sultan Mahmoud on the Janissaries, at whose hands they perished only thirteen years previously, had been recently recalled from his Pachalik in a distant province, at the instance of Khosrew Pacha and of the Sultana Valide, the mother of Abdul Medjid on no foolish or futile errand.

When old Khosrew and Halil, the latter the brother-in-law of Abdul Medjid, announced to the boy the death of his father and his own accession to the throne, it is said he neither manifested grief for the loss of his father, nor satisfaction for his elevation. He remained cold, silent, and a little timid. Perhaps he was frightened at his coming greatness, and incapable of analysing his confused sensations. Without delay, however, he appointed his brother-in-law Halil to the command of the army, and invested Khosrew with the dignity of Grand Vizier, a title which had been abolished by Mahmoud.

A very formidable conspiracy had been organized by the students and teachers of the religious schools and the inmates of the convents of the Dervishes—a crisis appeared inevitable, nevertheless, no one moved. Old Khosrew was on the watch; and the conspirators knew well what he was capable of doing, and ordaining to be done. The terrible Husein, the former Aga of the Janissaries who had been gained over by Sultan Mahmoud in June, 1826, and became the minister and executor

of his vengeance against the Janissaries, it was known had been recalled from Vardin, and his presence at the juncture in question, within the walls of the capital, was considered ominous and significant. So Abdul Medjid was allowed to take possession of, and to occupy the throne of his deceased father without molestation.

I have spoken sufficiently at large of the efforts he made to carry out the reforming views of his father, and even to surpass them. All the natural inclinations of this young man were good—mild and gentle in his manners, and just and humane in his sentiments—he abhorred acts of violence and blood-shed. It was his calamity to be bred in a religion which makes mercy, toleration and humanity, qualities at variance with the interests of the State, and religion of Mussulmans.

His education in the Harem, and the effects of a feeble organization ill directed in early life, imparted effeminacy to his appearance, and to some extent to his character. He was a benevolent, well-intentioned, justly thinking man, and of sound judgment generally, in matters, at least, which did not involve questions of finance or of expenditure. His great fault was extravagance. He wasted the resources of the empire, and his favourites followed the example, while the public creditor was unsatisfied, and fresh debts and taxes increased the burthens of the people. During the famine in Ireland, he was one of the most liberal contributors to Irish relief. He proposed to send ten thousand pounds out of his own private purse, but the British Ambassador considered a much smaller amount would suffice.

On his accession to the throne, he had recourse to the British Minister at Constantinople for advice and guidance, and from the beginning of his reign, his policy of reform and toleration, the whole régime of government and administration of justice, were publicly declared to be in accordance with European views. The famous Tanzimat, that re-organized *on paper* all the Institutions of the State, was proclaimed, and the praises of the new Sultan filled the leading journals of Europe and especially of

England. But the Tanzimat had no exclusive principle in it. And, no matter however excellent the intentions of the young Sultan may have been, there was no possibility of carrying them into execution. The Tanzimat fell still-born from the womb of State.

The young Sultan's career was a troubled one. He was, during his reign, in bad odour with his subjects, involved in several wars, overwhelmed with embarrassments, and the burden of public debt. When he died, the foreign journals that, in his early career, had extolled the young reforming Sultan who followed the advice of some diplomatic Nestor at the Porte, and sought to Europeanize his Mohammedan Empire, had no eulogies for his memory, not even a good word for his attempts at reform. Even the great virtue of humanity, which was so conspicuous in his conduct throughout his whole career, in notices I have seen of his death, was treated as a defect in his character which unfitted him for his throne. One morning journal, noticing his death says :—

"Abdul Medjid reigned in the midst of trouble, and his was not the nature by which trouble could be successfully opposed. There was nothing of sternness or determination in his composition—he was mild, gentle, and effeminate. A successor of Mahmoud and Amurath was so tender-hearted that he could not endure the sight of blood, and shrank from passing a capital sentence, even for the crime of high treason. The better parts of his character were well illustrated in that refusal to surrender the Hungarian and Polish refugees to Austria and Russia, which elicited the admiration of every true lover of freedom. But his merits were at the best of a character to shine but feebly in the occupant of a throne. He may have had good intentions, but he was without power to carry them into execution ; he may have framed excellent laws, but he could not put them into force ; and it was, no doubt, this inherent weakness of character that tempted those aggressions on the part of Russia, that led to the eventful Crimean campaign, by which Turkey has been saved for a season. What

her fate will be under Abdul Azis, the brother and successor of Abdul Medjid, no one can predict."

Another journal, on the same subject, observes :—

"The death of the descendant of Sultan Othman and of Solyman the Great, cannot be regarded in any other light than as a considerable benefit to his subjects. Whether the Turks could ever revive any portion of their ancient energies, even if they had such rulers as their early Sultans, is a matter of extreme doubtfulness. At least, they could not be worse situated than they have been under the rule of Sultan Abdul Medjid, who ascended the throne a mild and amiable boy, and died an old man wasted by excess ere he had attained his fortieth year. Few Sultans had a better start than he who is just dead. His fiery old father, Mahmoud, had murdered all the Janissaries shortly before his death, and the Janissaries were the only rivals near the throne that Turkish Sultans ever needed to fear. Great hopes were entertained of him, and he commenced his reign by the promulgation of an Edict of Universal Toleration. Unfortunately, he had not sufficient imperial power to enforce its provisions in distant pachalics. Not the less did he alienate from implicit loyalty the old Mohammedan party, who learn from the Koran that to slay a Giaour is to inherit heaven. At the same time, his own professions of tolerance, coupled with the undoubted impossibility of enforcing them, invited those various protectorates by the Christian Powers which weaken the central government, maintained chronic French and Russian intrigue, caused one war, and left the possible germs of many more. To crown the calamities of Abdul Medjid's reign, he was nurtured, and spent all his days under the shadow of the accursed 'social evil' of Mohammedan countries; and the chief tidings that we have had from Constantinople, in recent years, have been the profusion and prodigality of his expenditure for his hundreds of wives, and the palaces and kiosks they inhabit. We fear that the inevitable fate of Turkey is typified and foreshadowed by the ignoble career of its late ruler."

The 14 children of the late Sultan Abdul Medjid Khan, six

sons and eight daughters are thus enumerated and designated in the celebrated "Annuaire Diplomatique et Statistique Pour l'Année, 1861.—Almanach De Gotha," page 84.

1. Sultan Méhemmed Mourad Effendi, born 21st September, 1840.
2. Sultana Fatimah, born 1st Nov., 1840. Married in 1854 to Halib Pacha, a son of Redschid Pacha, deceased in 1858, married secondly to Mehemet Noury Pacha.
3. Sultana Refige, born 6th Feb., 1842, married in 1857 to Ethem Pacha.
4. Abdul Hamed Effendi, born 22nd Sept. 1842.
5. Sultana Djemile, born 18th Aug. 1843, married in 1858 to Mahmoud Gelal-Eddin Pacha.
6. Mehemmed-Rechad Effendi, born 3rd Nov. 1844.
7. Sultana Munire, born 9th Dec., 1844, married in 1858 to Ilhami Pacha, son of the Abbas Pacha, Viceroy of Egypt.
8. Ahwed Kemaleddin Effendi, born 3rd Dec., 1847.
9. Sultana Behige, born 16th July 1848, married in 1859 to Husni Pacha.
10. Mehemed-Buhran-Uddin, Effendi, born 23rd May, 1849.
11. Nour-Edden Effendi, born 14th April, 1851.
12. Sultana Senihè, born 21st Nov., 1851.
13. Sultana Féhimé, born 26th Jan., 1855.
14. Sultana Chémimé, born 1st March 1855.

Abdul Azis, the 32nd Sultan of the Ottoman Empire, the brother of the recently deceased Sultan Abdul Medjid, was born the 9th of Feb., 1830, consequently on his accession to the throne 24th of June, 1861, was in his 32nd year: an elder sister of his, Adileh (married to Mehemet Ali Pacha) was born in 1823.

In all respects different from his brother, the late Sultan, Abdul Azis is of a dogged and violent disposition—of a determined character, fierce in his hatred of Christianity and of Christians—a rigid Mussulman. The Ulema took him in hand at an early age, and moulded him according to their notions. He performs all the rites and forms of Mohammedanism,

with scrupulous regard to the injunctions of the Koran, and, was trained up for the special purpose of stemming the reforming spirit which Redshid Pacha had introduced into the government.

What will spring out of the change is for the future to resolve—whether the outlying provinces of the empire will take advantage of the occasion and assert their independence, or wait for the development of the new reign which European States will force into a liberal policy as the condition of their protection. Everything in Turkey indicates decay and dissolution. Notwithstanding the declaration of Lord Palmerston, that she has more real life now than at any period during the last two centuries—that her commerce is expanding, and her finances, if rightly applied, more than ample to meet all her engagements—diplomatists and statesmen, who had better opportunities of forming a correct estimate of Turkey, incline to the opposite view."

The "Moniteur" of the 27th of June, 1861, published the following notice :—

"A telegram has been received here, from Constantinople, announcing that Abdul Aziz, on the occasion of his accession to the throne, published a manifesto, in which he declared that he will follow the present foreign policy of the Turkish government. He also announced his intention to introduce great reforms in the interior in favour of all his subjects without distinction of religion. He concludes by insisting on the necessity for economical and financial reforms. The same telegram states that a modification of the Ministry is probable. Riza Pasha, the Minister of War, will, it is said, be replaced."

"We are told the death of the Sultan produced scarcely any effect upon the Paris Bourse. The general opinion seemed to be that, so far as regards the imminence of what is called the Eastern question, the Sultan was a better man than his predecessor, and more likely to adjourn the crisis."

The organs of the stock-jobbers in all countries, view public events of great pith and moment in one light only, and that

is, in the light of their present bearing on the funds; and whenever they propound opinions, signally at variance with the existing aspect of affairs, it is found that they are making their wishes fathers to their thoughts, and are exceedingly apprehensive their wishes will not be realized.

The leading organ of English public opinion has fulminated a leading article on the death of the late Sultan, and the destiny of the Turkish Empire; wherein, under a thin veil of apparently unbounded confidence in the good results of centralization, reform, and civilization in Turkey; and above all in the Turkish policy of our government for the past twenty years, and the protection of Western diplomacy, the most profound conviction peeps through almost every passage, that the Turkish Empire is on its last legs; the Turkish people are sunk in languor and lethargy, and the Turkish religion, is a faith condemned to an inexorable fate, from which no human effort can save it.

Some of the following passages of an article of "The Times," of the 26th of June, 1861, are remarkable for the ability and inconsistency that are blended in them :—

"Sultan Abdul Medjid is no more."

"Short has been his life, and troubled his reign, and he sinks into his grave at the age of thirty-eight, leaving a wasted empire, a decaying people, and a doomed religion to his successor."

"Abdul Medjid has reigned twenty-two years, under the protection of Western diplomacy. The statesman who is now at the head of the British government, may be considered to have been his guardian from the day of his boyish accession till now that he has sunk, a prematurely old man, into the grave. He ascended the throne in 1839, on the death of his strong-minded and courageous father, Mahmoud II., the Henry VIII. of Turkey, the destroyer of the Janissaries, the humbler of the vassals and officials of the empire, the centralizer and reformer, the great author of what is called Turkish civilization. It requires much confidence to affirm that measures adopted

under the advice of great European statesmen, and by the help of learned and active men from all parts of Europe, should have no good results, and that Turkey, by relinquishing barbarism, has thrown away the vital element of its own constitution, and we certainly hold no such opinion. But this may be said, that the thin and superficial civilization with which Sultan Mahmoud incrusted the rough race over whom he ruled, did not add to their strength or their confidence in themselves, though for a quarter of a century it imposed on Europe. When Abdul Medjid succeeded, he found himself master of a State in which Mohammedans had begun to dress after the model of Christian Europe, in which coats, and boots, and furniture had begun to be modelled after the fashions of Paris, in which schools were founded to teach sciences which the language of the country had not words to express, and which at the same time was subject to every evil which can afflict a body politic."

"The policy of Lord Palmerston, which triumphed on the occasion of Mohammed Ali's attempt on Syria and the Asiatic provinces of the Turkish Empire, has for twenty years since been accepted as that which ought to govern the dealings of Europe with the Turkish Empire. It may be summed up in a few words. To defend the Sultan against Foreign Potentates, and to aid him in ruling his own Pashas, has been the endeavour of England during the whole reign of Abdul Medjid. The results have been most remarkable. A tranquillity and order, a centralization without example for completeness, and a ready and even ostentatious loyalty to the Porte, marks every Mohammedan Governor throughout the empire. While the Danubian provinces have become virtually independent, while Servia and Montenegro are defiant as usual, the Sultan's authority extends peaceably to the borders of the French possessions in Africa, and to the shores of the Persian Gulf. But, with all this seeming unity and strength, the Turkish Empire is now more decripit than when Abdul Medjid began to reign, for the Turks themselves have lost heart and energy. The shock of war braces the nerves of a race which, with real vi-

tality of constitution, is sunk in languor or lethargy; but it is too much for those who are approaching their allotted term of years. The Turks have not rallied after the war of 1854. It is plain that whatever destiny may be reserved for the people, the whole fabric of Mohammedan society must be changed before new energy can be infused into it. Abdul Medjid was a type of the race and of the system. He was eminently a civilized Turk, as his father, Mahmoud, had made the governing classes. He was kind, averse from severity even to a fault; he had manners which became his high station, and went through his interviews with foreign ambassadors very decorously and courteously. But activity and forethought, and proper care for the empire, were utterly wanting. It is of no use to enlarge upon the private life of this unhappy prince, who, establishing a harem at the age of fourteen or fifteen, had the look and bearing of an old man before attaining middle age. His extravagance, and the extravagance of his wives, knew no bounds. How they spent their money is almost inconceivable. It went, not by thousands, but by millions of pounds sterling. Ever new palaces, new diamonds, new pensions to favourites or schemers of all kinds swallowed up revenues which would be considered large even in England. He has brought Turkey almost to the ground. His numerous sons and daughters have been magnificently provided for at the expense of the exhausted empire. He is now gone, and another, the thirty-second of the family of Othman, succeeds. This is Aziz Effendi, his brother, and the only other surviving son of Mahmoud. Aziz is said very much to resemble his father in character and vigour of will, but to be not a reformer and free-thinker, but a strict Mahommedan, and a reactionary in politics. Whatever may be his views, it is certainly an advantage to Turkey to have a ruler with some vigour of character, for even a despot of the school of Mahmoud or Mehemet Ali is better than a feeble sluggard like the Prince who has just passed away."

The "feeble sluggard" as the late Sultan Abdul Medjid, is termed who was "a civilized Turk" however, and "of manners

which became his high station," a "kind" man and "even averse to severity to a fault," was eminently tolerant, more so perhaps than any Turkish Sultan who preceded him—totally the reverse of his vigorous successor, his brother, the "strict Mohammedan," as he is described in the 'Times,' the fierce fanatic who was mixed up with the recent conspiracy got up in Constantinople, that terminated in the massacres of the Christians in the Lebanon, finds no favor in the sight of the organs of public opinion in France and England. But the strict Mussulman who hates Christianity and Christians, Abdul Aziz has some peculiar claim to consideration. The writer of the article I have just quoted, proclaims his preference for the new Sultan, "we think it likely that the new Sultan will prove a man of more powerful mind than his brother." . . .

"Whatever may be his views it is certainly an advantage to Turkey to have a ruler *with some vigor of character, &c., rather than a feeble sluggard like the prince who has passed away.*"

The latest news from Constantinople, confirms the opinion just expressed of the Turkish Empire, having got a ruler of some vigor of character.

"It is thought that the new Sultan will make a daring attempt to rouse the long dormant energies of the Mussulman population by working on their fanaticism, and that the Christians will be the first to feel the effect of the change."

The energy of the character of the successor of improvident Abdul Medjid was first displayed after his accession to the throne in a warfare in the name of economy on all the establishments connected with the late Imperial household, or that of the families and immediate friends and relations of the late Sultan. His household and harem, immediately after his death, were broken up with greater haste than comported with the respect due to the deceased Sultan. The old ministers, supposed to be favourable to toleration, were got rid of, and one of them was replaced by a Pacha, whose name is associated with certain massacres of Christians committed at Jedda, in his temporary absence indeed, but probably not without his

presumed satisfaction at the result of his previous fanatic regime.

It is very evident the Nestor of Eastern diplomacy perfectly understands the new Sultan and the peculiar vigour of his character.

In the House of Lords, 28th of June, 1861, the policy of Turkey and recent change of rulers, was made the subject of discussion :—

"Lord Stratford de Redcliffe inquired if the government had any information as to the policy likely to be pursued by the new Sultan of Turkey. The danger of a policy of reaction at the present crisis would be very great. The late Sultan, though indolent, and stained with oriental vices, had continued the great reform begun by his father, and had acted throughout his reign in a spirit of liberality and toleration. The present Sultan was represented to be a more energetic and violent man, disposed towards a revolutionary policy, and he thought that the Christian powers might interpose with their advice. He himself, from personal experience, was conscious of the peril which a revolutionary policy would involve, and, therefore, wished to know if the government had received official intelligence of the accession of the new Sultan, and whether they had reason to expect from him a reactionary policy."

The Constantinople correspondent of a London paper, says :—

"The new Sovereign's activity and lively interest in the working of the different departments of the State appears to suffer no diminution as the novelty wears off. Every day a visit is paid to one or other of the public offices or institutions. A decided preference, however, is shown for the military and naval services, and the constant donations to the regiments which happen to be on duty at any place His Majesty visits, give rise to a doubt whether revenues which have hitherto been squandered on the women and attendants of the Palace may not, for the future, be consumed in the more dangerous, if more useful, taste of playing at soldiers.

"Among the new arrangements in the palace, was one relating to the dismissal of the Kislar Agha, or chief of the eunuchs, a functionary of Sultan Abdul Medjid, with a salary of 30,000 piastres a month, which created great consternation in the Seraglio."

The following curious correspondence is published in a Trieste newspaper of September, 1861 :—

"Sultan Abdul Aziz promised to follow, and even to go beyond his brother, in the path of reform. Strangely enough, however, all the acts of his government maintain a medium position between progress and conservatism, and are often so ambiguous that neither party know what to rely upon. True it is that the ultra old Turkish party believe that they have the Padischah with them, and rejoice over every new decree that seems directed against progress or against the foreigner. Everybody applauded the Sultan when he showed a disposition to abolish the ruinous harem system by no longer keeping so many wives; but an order lately given is in the strongest contrast with the previous dispositions. Abdul Aziz has sent a deputation of the Circassian slave-dealers here resident to their native country, to bring him thence 150 young and beautiful girls for his harem. Meanwhile, many payments are seven and ten months in arrear, and foreigners especially are great sufferers under the new Sultan's strange system of reforms. In Stamboul, the other day an interesting public auction took place, which deserves notice as an illustration of how things are managed under the new regime. Illinski, the brave Polish general, who is perhaps better known as Iskander Pasha, died a poor man, and left to his widow and children, besides a little household furniture, nothing but considerable debts and claims on the military chest. Instead of behaving with due consideration to the widow of an intrepid officer, who had grown gray and been repeatedly wounded in the Turkish service—instead of at once handing to her the Pacha's arrears of pay—the Minister of War caused Iskander's scanty chattels to be put up to public

auction, in order, as it was alleged, to pay his debts. After numerous memorials to the new Ministers and the Sultan, it is said a small pension will be given to the widow."

The efforts of the new Sultan to diminish the expenditure, in whatever motives they originated, were meritorious; but the ultimate advantages expected from them, and the State-regenerating results from them which have been such frequent themes of praise and gratulation in the columns of French and English journals, will never be realized.

A glance at the Finances of Turkey will plainly show this to be the case.

LATEST FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF THE TURKISH EMPIRE.

In August, 1861, a remarkable official document, printed by order of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—a statement of the Finances of the Turkish Empire at the present time, drawn up by the British Ambassador at Constantinople, Sir Henry Bulwer, with great care and ability. This statement, for its accuracy as to amounts, may be considered more reliable than accounts of travellers and other casual inquirers into this subject, which have been referred to in the preceding volume. The following extract from Sir Henry Bulwer's statement is therefore laid before my readers. It is necessary, however, they should bear in mind that the main object of this report of our Ambassador, is to show that the Finances of Turkey are in a prosperous condition, that her public debt is small in proportion to her revenues, and that her resources (which remain to be developed) are of a nature calculated to inspire confidence in her condition, and to raise her credit in the money markets of England and France. All the arguments used to support that view, the author believes to be mere sophistry. Turkey is not solvent. Her principal revenues, mortgaged to foreign capitalists, are

not applicable to ordinary governmental expenditure. The State could not live without yearly loans from foreign capitalists. The empire, in fact, is dependant on them.

Let not the reader therefore, when he examines the several items of the Revenue, allow himself to be imposed on by the supposition that all these amounts are applicable to ordinary state expenditure charges for carrying on the government, incurred and defrayed in the country. He will find the indirect taxes mortgaged to an enormous amount, to English and French capitalists, as the author has shewn elsewhere.

The following are the statements above referred to of Sir Henry Bulwer:—

REVENUE.

	£
Direct taxes	3,067,146
Indirect taxes	7,500,604
Produce of State property and public establishments	305,779
Fixed receipts	427,631
Miscellaneous	142,741
Total	11,443,901

And on the other side of the account:—

EXPENDITURE.

	£
Interest on debt	2,049,153
Expenses connected with religion	459,189
Civil list	1,393,123
Pensions	282,078
General services	9,222,501
	13,406,044
Deduct:—	
Measures of economy which have been ORDERED—	
Civil list £391,722	
Reductions in general services 1,269,120	
	1,660,842
Total expenditure	11,745,202

And the general result is:—

	£
Expenditure	11,745,202
Revenue	11,443,901
Deficit	301,301

Sir Henry Bulwer estimates that under proper management the revenue might be increased a third, and the expenses lessened a third.

If both these reforms could be effected, the balance sheet would stand:—

	£
Revenue	15,258,534
Expenditure	7,830,135
Surplus	7,428,399

Credit is taken by Sir H. Bulwer, for hypothetical economies:—

	£
In the civil list. . .	391,722
In the general services .	1,269,120
	1,660,842

"The Economist" cannot fail to see through the fallaciousness of a diplomatic financial statement—such as the preceding one. The anticipation of the Revenue stares him in the face. He cannot but think £1,660,842 out of a revenue of £11,433,901, is a large amount to save in a single year and demanding great administrative skill, great ability, and indomitable will, to save it in practice as well as on paper. But this patent uncertainty in the published statement is not the worst. As usual, the more critical difficulties are latent. The revenues above calculated have been forestalled, and the mode in which this has happened indicates a system of financial administration which will effectually preclude all financial prosperity, what-

ever may be the resources of the country, so long as it continues.

The revenues are in the hands of the State creditors. Money has been urgently required for the public service, and, as it could not otherwise be obtained, the public income has been mortgaged. Every year the same difficulty has recurred, and every year the mortgage has grown greater. A great deal of ready money,—"equal," Sir Henry Bulwer says, "to several millions, if not a year's revenue,"—must be obtained before the regular revenues of the country can be in the hands of the Government; and, unfortunately, ready money is the very thing which the Turkish Government never has—the very thing from want of which they have fallen into the present difficulties.

The following is Sir Henry Bulwer's "official account" of the public debt of Turkey:—

	£	£
Domestic debt		18,312,000
Foreign debt:—		
Loan of 1854, at 6 per cent. . .	3,000,000	
Loan of 1855, guaranteed by France and England, at 4 per cent . .	5,000,000	
Loan of 1858, at 6 per cent . .	5,000,000	
Loan of 1860, in France, through M. Mirès, at 6 per cent . .	2,037,220	
	15,037,220	
Less sinking fund, about . .	500,000	
		14,537,220
		32,849,220

The total amount annually paid for interest on the above debt, foreign and domestic, is £2,049,048.

Sir Henry Bulwer has given the several items of this charge in the detailed return of the expenditure, but it did not suit the argument of his Financial Statement to give the sum total of them, or to point attention to the enormous amount of this

charge for interest on the debt, say £2,049,048, in comparison with the moderate amount of the revenue, say £11,443,901.

General Budget of Income and Expenditure of the Turkish Empire for the year 1860.

INCOME.

	£	
Direct taxes :—		
Verghi, a rude sort of Income Tax	2,522,315	
Military redemption impost	544,831	
		3,067,146
Taxes	3,248,136	
Tax on sheep	756,120	
Tax on pigs	95,535	
Customs	1,611,587	
Customs on tobacco, including the right of sale	257,999	
Tax on fishing	78,759	
Produce of contracts	21,488	
Produce of stamps	28,457	
Tax on spirits	339,921	
Japan (imitation China)	131,844	
Sundry taxes	930,758	
		7,500,604
Public establishments :—		
Post Office	57,285	
Imperial Printing Office	8,372	
Property belonging to the State	31,611	
		97,268
Produce of Domains and Legal Rights :—		
Fisheries	18,302	
Forests	6,018	
Imperial farms	71,390	
Salt-pits	97,725	
Mines	10,451	
Sales of landed property	4,625	
		208,511
Tributes :—		
Fixed receipts	427,631	
		427,631
		11,301,160

	£	£
Add:—Special revenues of the Minister of Marine . . .	135,636	
Special revenues of the Minister of Commerce	7,105	
		142,741
Total receipts		11,443,901

EXPENDITURE.

	£
Foreign Debt:—	
Interest and redemption of debts contracted in Europe	842,986
Internal Debt:—	
Esham Djedidié, interest and redemption. .	182,800
Interest of the Sehims, of the Hasneh Tahvili, and with the bonds ten years to run . .	428,098
Interest and annuities of the Eshams, Moucatais, Timar, &c.	447,283
Interest of a loan from the Orphan's Bank, and of the war debts transferred . . .	147,981
Religious grant to the province of Hedgas, &c.: Yeman Surre (Group) Envoys to Mecca, &c.	459,189
Civil List:—	
Civil list and other allowances to relatives .	1,393,123
Pensions, &c.:—	
Pensions and aid to retired and necessitous functionaries	163,674
Ministers without portfolio, Tanzimat and Council of Justice	118,404
General Services:—	
Minister of War	4,491,272
Ordnance Department	293,243
Minister of Marine	898,051
Minister of Justice	97,391
Expenses connected with a certain kind of property called Vacoufs	173,494
Minister of the Interior	1,637,412
Minister of Foreign Affairs	148,200
Minister of Commerce	66,034
Minister of Public Instruction . . .	22,970
Minister of Police	127,186

Minister of Finance		£968,662
Charge omitted in the Budget of the Minister of Finance, but which should have been inserted by him		298,576
		13,406,044
Deduct :—		
Relinquished by the Civil List. .	391,722	
Deductions notified to the Council, &c.	1,269,120	
		1,660,842
There would remain of ordinary expenditure .		11,745,202

The natural state of the Turkish Government is one of insolvency, a perpetual state of want of ready money. Whenever a loan is negociated for, this condition of permanent embarrassment is so urgent that advantage is taken of its distress, and exhorbitant terms are proposed and accepted for any advances made.

This was the case when arrangements for a loan were entered into in the present year (1861), with a French stock jobber of notoriety. The Porte in treating for this loan, was quite content to pay an immense douceur called "commission" to M. Mirès for a small portion of the loan to be paid in hand.

Sir Henry Bulwer, however desirous he may be to bolster up the sick man's sinking credit, is not ignorant of the anomalous and dangerous position in which his Empire stands.

Sir H. Bulwer fully conscious of the evils that beset Turkish rule, describes them graphically :—

"The Ottoman Government (says Sir Henry), when it undertook to place the Empire on a new foundation, was neither entirely sincere in its professions, nor did it clearly understand what it was about. It accepted the announcement of great, immense, and sudden reforms, less with a desire to reinvigorate Turkey than to gain Europe. It was less occupied with the laws it was to make than with the newspaper articles it would produce. It consequently undertook too much, too suddenly,

and got confused amidst the novelties it promulgated. An uncertainty between the old and the new everywhere prevailed, and still prevails. A Pacha said to me the other day, "What am I to do? I govern a province, and the grand Vizier sends me an order which is framed on the new ideas that we profess. The Sheik-ul-Islam complains against me because I do not act upon the old laws, which with him are still sacred. I say the two things are incompatible; and I am told I must follow our own usages, but I must give them a new dress. I don't know what I am about."

"The object of late years has been to destroy personal responsibility of functionaries; and this project, as all functionaries have been interested in it, has succeeded. The Pacha can throw the blame of his acts on the Medjilis of his provinces. The minister of every department can say that his measures bear the signatures of all his colleagues. Add to this the endeavour to apply the complicated habits of European administration, and the refinement of European codes through the medium of people altogether ignorant of both; an accumulation of business in each department by the modern practice of immense and constant correspondence with no classification; and officials over whom there is no practical control."

Such is the state of things in all the govermental departments which exist in Constantinople and the administrations in the provinces, thus ably described by the British minister, Sir Henry Bulwer, a statistical writer of great eminence.

CHAPTER XV.

The Beginning of the End of the Turkish Empire.—Failure of its Institutions to fulfil the legitimate purposes of Governmental Regime, the well-being and protection of the people subject to it.—The Decay of Turkey, and impossibility of its Maintainance and Restoration.

A REMARKABLE article in the *Times*, in the past year, on the Syrian disturbances, commenced with these words:—"What are we to do with the Druses?" That question might be answered, More Hibernicé, by proposing another—"What are we to do with Turkey?"

This is really and truly the great question of the age. It is not a mere question of the extension of French influence or English; of Protestantism or Catholicism; it is one of the highest importance to the interests of humanity and civilization (rightly understood), far beyond the regions which are included in the Turkish Empire.

Nothing can be more clearly understood in Europe; nothing is more comprehensible to the intelligence of all people, even of those only tolerably well informed in every capital of Europe —that the Turkish Empire, utterly effete, decayed, rotten to its core, and devoid of mental energy, physically exhausted and destitute of all vigour and elements of vitality as it is, could not possibly subsist, if British diplomacy was not continually engaged in procuring for it a sort of Frankenstein monster existence, the violent and irregular movements of which it is unable to control, and if British capital, in the shape of loans, was not supplying the place of ordinary revenue to carry on the

government of this broken-down, bankrupt State, and thus enabling its fanaticism to live, and to animate and invigorate its barbarous institutions.

The Turkish Empire has now had its seat in the heart of Europe for four centuries—has had possession of several of its finest provinces and most fertile regions in Asia Minor, Messopotamia, Egypt, and Arabia Felix, of vast tracts of country, and territories of enormous extent in other parts of Asia and in Africa, formerly renowned for their productiveness and populousness, in some regions for periods varying from six to twelve centuries.

What has been everywhere the effect of Turkish rule and occupation? Ruin, desolation, industry trodden down, all energy and enterprise crushed, civilisation banished, Christianity proscribed, persecuted—the rich soil cursed by the evil influences of Mohammedanism, left uncultivated, depopulated, a wilderness of verdure, have been the result.

Every book of travel in the Turkish Empire—every work of any value, old or new, on the resources, regime, prospects, and condition of Turkey, tells the same heart-sickening tale of decay, of rapacity, and oppression, of brutalised force and terribly abused power, of government that answers not one of its legitimate aims and ends—the well-being and protection of the human beings who are subject to it.

Do Ministers of a civilized State, of a Christian nation, incur any moral responsibility, who labour incessantly, year after year, to sustain a power so inimical to civilization, so entirely incapacitated for progress or enlightenment, and incapable of fulfilling the duties of a State to its inhabitants?

Perhaps they are unconscious that any such responsibility is incurred by them. If they are so, most earnestly it is to be hoped and prayed for them, that they shall cease to be self-blinded and deceived as they seem to have been, before they appear at another tribunal, one more dread than that of public opinion or parliamentary privilege and authority.

The following passages illustrate the gradual decline of Tur-

key, from the period of her arrival at the summit of her greatness.

Two hundred and twenty years ago, Knolles said of this empire, "If you consider its beginning, progress, and uninterrupted success, there is nothing in the world more admirable and strange; of the greatness thereof, *nothing more dreadful or dangerous;* which wondering at nothing but the beauty of itself, and drunk with the pleasant wine of perpetual felicity, holdeth all the rest of the world in scorn."

Busbequiius shortly after described the Turks as "trampling on the mangled bodies of hostile sovereigns and their subjects, reaching to the frontiers of Austria, and threatening Vienna itself."

Sandys, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, said, "It was to be hoped that their greatness was not only at its height, but near an extreme precipitation: the body being grown too monstrous for the head; the Sultans unwarlike, being corrupted with ease, wine, and women; their valour now meeting with opposition: the empire so got, when it beginneth to decline, doth begin to diminish."

Aaron Hill, one hundred and twenty years ago, thus describes the *Ottomans.* "Their European dominions are extended to the very borders of once lost Hungary, stretching to the Adriatic, by the Ragusian confines; bounded on the south by the Mediterranean Sea, on the east by the Pontus, Propontus, and Egean, even to the Scythian Chersonesus."

"But of late," he continued, "they are become modest; which may proceed from their numerous disappointments, that, in their modern wars, have so frequently baffled their presumtuous armies; and by curbing the designs of their ambitious Sultans, have taught them better how to know themselves, and prize their neighbours."

I know not in what history to seek a parallel for the sudden aggrandisement of the Turkish nation: as the last author has quaintly expressed it, "swallowing up at a morsel the conquests of Macedonian Alexander, and outdoing the stupendous

victories of the successful Jews!" And neither do I know in what history to seek a picture of national decline so striking as that of Turkey. A century and a half has sufficed to strip her of her glory, and to wring from her more than half her conquests. The pompous titles of her boundaries; the Pontus, the Propontis, the Egea, and the Adriatic, are now vain words; Circassia, the Crimea, Greece, Georgia, are gone; Bulgaria, Bosnia, are virtually lost.

MacFarlane, author of "Constantinople in 1828," published a work in 1850, entitled, "Turkey and its Destiny, the result of Journeys made in 1847 and 1848, to examine into the state of that Country." This work contains some valuable information with respect to the actual position of the Turkish Empire.

Our most eminent statesmen believe in the regeneration of Turkey—social, of course, as well as political.

But what will they say to the following observations of Mac Farlane?

"I would repeat again and again that this seclusion, or rather separation, of the wives (for the women are anything rather than secluded) is incompatible with any real advance of civilization, and that until this accursed harem system be abolished, of which there is at present not the slightest sign, there is not the shadow of a hope for that social regeneration, without which Turkey must perish amidst the scorn and contempt of the world. If you degrade the mother and the first teacher of the future man, the demoralization of the parent tells on the child. The first lessons are the strongest and the most enduring of all. The child receives his first education in the harem, be he the son of a Sultan or of the poorest of Turks; and what are the lessons he gets there from ignorant, indolent, and sensual women?"*

Mr. Urquhart, it is well known, is a firm believer in the regeneration of Turkey, and the power and excellence of the

* "Turkey and its Destiny," vol. 2, p. 257.

Turkish municipal institutions, which he designates the "Amphictyonic Councils," as essential existing elements of justice, law, and order, which may at any time be called from a somewhat drowsy and lethargic condition, into a state of activity, and be made great reforming agencies fully capable of regenerating the Turkish Empire. Mr. Urquhart sincerely believes in Turkey, and ardently loves its laws and institutions.

Mr. Mc Farlane has no faith in the Amphictyonic Councils; he has seen their working in Brusa, and described it fully in his work on Turkey, at page 41, vol. 2. He does not believe in the regeneration of Turkey. He denounces all the so-called reforms attempted in the reigns of Mahmoud the 2nd and his successor, as mere shams, flams, mockeries, and delusions.

In the Brusa Council or Shoorah, when Mc Farlane visited that important town, composed of thirteen members, nine were Mussulmans, and four were Rayahs—a heterodox Armenian (the Pacha's Banker), a Greek notable, a Jewish Rabbi, an orthodox Catholic Armenian notable. But two of the four Rayah members of the Council had already withdrawn, in disgust and despair of being able to check or control, in the smallest degree, the rapacity of the Pacha and his government. "In hardly any case," says Mc Farlane, "do they allow the Council a deliberative voice.

Skene, the British Consul at Aleppo, by far the most able and intelligent of all British functionaries in the Levant, in a report published in a Blue Book for 1860, of Consular communications on the trade statistics, &c., of the several countries they were employed in, in reference to a project (which meets with little encouragement at his hands) for connecting the Persian Gulph with the Mediterranean by a line of railway running along the valley of the Euphrates, makes the following observation:—"*Though the surrounding districts could thus be restored to their pristine fertility, such a change cannot be expected so long as Turkish misrule continues to weigh as an incubus on all enterprise, native as well as foreign.*"

Haleb, or Aleppo, says Mr. Consul Skene, at the beginning

of the 18th century, was supposed to contain 300,000 inhabitants. "But the natural effects of Turkish misrule and the increasing commerce by the Cape of Good Hope checked its growth." Repeated earthquakes, and especially that of 1822, which shook the town to its foundations, helped to complete its ruin. Mr. Skene estimates the present population of Aleppo at 100,000 souls, about 15,000 of whom are Christians.

In the middle of the last century, two hundred places where people had settled in the tract of country lying between Constantinople and Smyrna, including a region as fertile as any in the world, had become forsaken. In 1824, I travelled over that tract of country then waste and desolate, between Constantinople and Smyrna, a distance of 300 miles, and had ample opportunity of meditating on the results of Turkish rule—the inevitable tendency of it, the same now that it was when the Seljukian Tartars founded the Ottoman Empire, namely, to bring cultivation into decay, to crush and discourage industry —to make the land where Turkish rule had been established desolate.

Wherever Turkish rule exists, civilization must die out. The state of nature there, is a state of war with peaceful industry. Population and prosperity fade away. Rapacity and insolence cannot long abide except with poverty and wretchedness. Everything that has been constructed, is left to go to ruin and dilapidation. Everything that is done by Turkish authority tends to brutalize the character or to crush the spirit of man.

Go to whatever Turkish province you will, the peasantry are sure to be found poor, miserable, and oppressed, failing in number, deteriorating in condition.

The island of Candia, with which I am well acquainted, is one of the most fertile islands in the Mediterranean.

Its hundred cities are dwindled to a few wretched towns and villages. Its inhabitants are indigent, crushed by Turkish rapacity.

Cyprus of old celebrated for its fertility, its corn, wine

and metals—for the excellence of its soil and of its climate, is no longer "the paradise of the Levant," with its million of inhabitants. Its population is reduced to 30,000, cultivation is neglected, the people are oppressed, the country has ceased to be fertile, productive, populous, wholesome, and agreeable. The curse of Turkish rule upon it.

But humanity, outraged as it is in those dominions of the Turk, has its consolations. The Ottoman Moslems are dying out in Europe. Diarbekr with its population of 400,000; the middle of the last century in the course of forty years, had dwindled down to 50,000.

Bassora has fallen in its population from 100,000, to 8,000. Bagdad from 430,000 to 20,000. Mosul, in the memory of man, has lost half its inhabitants.

In Egypt, Turkish rule has had the same result as elsewhere, Egypt (says Mr. Alison), after all the revolutions which it had undergone, was rich and populous; but since the era of Turkish conquest, the repacious Turkish rule, the tyranny of the Pachas has expelled industry, riches, and the arts."

Another historian speaks in similar terms of Turkish rule:

"That fertile territory," says Robertson, "which sustained the Roman Empire, still lies in a great measure uncultivated; and that province. which Victor called *Speciositas totius terræ florentis*, is now the retreat of pirates and banditti."

"I have travelled," says Mr. Thornton, "through several provinces of European Turkey, and cannot convey an idea of the state of desolation, in which that beautiful country is left. For the space of seventy miles, between Kir Kalise and Carnabat, there is not an inhabitant, though the country is an earthly paradise. The extensive and pleasant village of Faki, with its houses deserted, its gardens overrun with weeds and grass, its lands waste and uncultivated, and now the resort of robbers, affects the traveller with the most painful sensations."

In the Morea, Chateaubriand, wherever he went, beheld villages destroyed by fire and sword, whole suburbs deserted, often fifteen leagues without a single habitation.

Dr. Newman in his lectures on Turkish history, states "the population of the whole Turkish Empire, is not a fifth of what it was in ancient times." Of two of its most fertile provinces, "not more than a fortieth part is under tillage."

A very able writer, profoundly acquainted with the Eastern question, in an article on the disturbances of Syria in the British Quarterly Review, makes the following observations on the Turkish Empire :—

"The Moslems have now for twelve centuries been the rulers of Syria: and at the present moment they constitute four-fifths of its whole population. Several distinct dynasties and races have during that period risen and fallen ; but the laws laid down by Mohammed, and embodied in the Koran, have been uniformly followed by them all. To understand Syria's mournful history, we must understand these laws. To discover the causes of the country's decay, of its progressive depopulation, and of the recent fearful massacres, we must study the principles of morality and legislation upon which the Mohammedan Government is based. The time has fully come for the politicians of Western Europe, and especially of England, to examine with care the genius of *Islâm*. The day has passed and gone for ever when Christian Europe trembled at that name, and the period has arrived when, by the exercise of an enlightened policy, one of the fairest portions of the world may be saved from its withering influence. The lessons learned from history are among the statesman's best instructors and safest guides. The history of the past twelve centuries, shows but too plainly the effects of Islâm on both individuals and nations—its moral effects, its physical effects, and its political effects. In the consideration of this subject, we must carefully distinguish between the *Mohammedan* Empire and the *Turkish* Empire. The former is the empire established by Mohammed, and which has ever received the Koran as its guide in all things, civil and religious. The latter is only one of its dynasties. The latter might still remain in power though it departed from the other. This act of separation might be effected at any time by the will of the sovereign

sion, on the question—*Is it for the good of the interests of the faith of Christians, for the interest of civilization, which are not only bound up with, but based on that faith, that the Turkish Empire and its Mohammedan institutions, should be maintained.*

Is it for the honour of the English nation, for the prestige of British philanthropy, for the character of British statesmen, for the morality of their high state policy, and the glory of the sovereign of these realms, that the Ottoman Empire with all its innate hatred of christianity, and indomitable spirit of fanaticism, and irreclaimable barbarity and savagery in governmental administration, should owe the continuation of its being to British statesmanship, and to British gold.

Some admirable sentences, worthy of being written in letters of gold, are to be found in an ably conducted weekly journal, on "interests, real and supposed."

We wish statesmen, who devote vast energies to purposes of temporary expediency, or of questionable morality, would turn their minds to the study of the history and "the inexorable logic of facts" therein recorded.

He would there discover—"that justice, and truth, and honor are the weightiest interests of the nations of the earth; and avarice, selfishness, and ambition dig the graves and weave the shrouds of peoples otherwise prosperous and strong. National existence ought not to be preferred to honour. National conscience is nobler than material wealth. Glory is lost when justice is violated, or goodness persecuted, or wrong inflicted. Athens sunk into a village, Carthage buried in the sands, Babylon represented by a few molten bricks, Egypt perpetuated in its gigantic pyramidal tombs, Venice with its palatial steps covered by the seaweeds—Naples, and Rome, and Vienna, all speak one 'inexorable fact,' that the vital element of national greatness is moral, not material; and that every attempt to reverse this great law has recoiled on the experimentalist in ruin and remorse. The mark of decadence is visible where many trumpets once sounded forth prophecies of immortality. Names that shook the world are forgotten.

Genoa was once a powerful and wealthy republic; it is now a memory, and little more. The free cities of Flanders are cities of the dead. The phalanx of the Macedonian, the legions of Rome, the guards of Napoleon, did nothing to perpetuate, and much to overturn the empires to which they belonged. The foundations of empires are composed of better and more lasting materials."

But this Turkish Empire exists, and the question it will be said is,—What is to be done with it?

Are we, by violent means, to bring it to an end?

To this I answer, our duty to Christianity and to civilization does not require us to do so. Such means are not legitimate, and, therefore, could not be adopted by people who believe in Christianity. All that is necessary for us to do, all that is legitimate for us to do, is to leave this Turkish Empire to itself; to let it fall by the weight of its own iniquities.

We have caused the deaths of upwards of a quarter of a million of human beings, from 1852 to 1856, in endeavouring to maintain this empire.

Our capitalists have supplied the far greater portion of thirty millions sterling, in loans, to have this government carried on. Let Turkey be left to fight her own battles, to find her own resources.

The ultimate disposal of her territories cannot be determined, regulated, or legitimated, by any ally of hers, however ancient, faithful, and natural he may be. The dismemberment even of the Turkish Empire, that might be most desired and promoted by certain European powers, solely with a view to their own sordid views of territorial aggrandisement, eventually in all probability would be more advantageous to the commercial interests, and therefore to the imperial interests of Great Britain, than it would be to them.

When we entered on the Russian war for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire, we were informed, on the highest authority, that we had embarked in it in behalf of the interests of civilization.

The interests of civilization there are identified with those of the Turkish Empire. And as our civilization is identified with Christianity, and Mohammedanism is the basis of all Turkish power, it follows that Christianity is interested in the protection and defence of Mohammedanism. When we speak of barbarism, we mean to speak of a state of ignorance of all laws, divine and human, and of subjugation of reason to passion, of an existence in which the appetites are indulged, prejudices are fostered, fiercely contended for, and no talents are improved, no social progress, no intellectual advancement is made. And when we speak of civilization, we must mean (if anything is meant by the term) a state of mental cultivation and moral discipline, in which a man is able to subordinate his appetites and natural impulses to reason, by the joint influence of education and religion. Civilization then tends to improvement, progress, refinement, and humanization, to energy of character, action, the development of an inner life, the exercise of all faculties given to us, and modes of thought that are calculated to exalt our nature, and to show that—"we are born to do benefits."

Civilization owes its origin and its progress to the elements of Christianity which surround it. Suppose religion was discarded and that science and art, skill and ability in physics, in politics, in œconomics, and mechanics, were only looked to for the maintenance, the advancement, and perfectability of civilization, what grievous disappointment would not be experienced. But what is called civilization in parliamentary phraseology and newspaper literature, is more generally ascribed to commerce and political economy than to religion. It is vain, however, we look to trade and political economy, and material developments only for tendency to civilization. The true elements of civilization are to be found in intellectual, moral, and religious principles, in the power of self-control, self-concentration, and the ability to appreciate duly the interests of truth, justice and humanity.

Are we prepared to encounter another Crimean war for Turkey and her abominable institutious?

I have elsewhere given at large official details of the expenditure we encountered, and the loss of life we sustained in the Crimean war.

In that war, undertaken and carried on, for the maintenance of the Turkish Empire, according to Mr. Milner Gibson's estimate, we expended, in round numbers, 100 millions sterling, and lost about 50,000 men.

But if we reduce those numbers—the former item for expenditure to 60 millions, and the latter for loss of life to the period of the return to England, of the survivors of the English army, to 30,000 men, we can find evidence for those estimates in official returns.

Is it for the interest, honor, or glory of Great Britain, to expend sixty or one hundred millions more of money, and thirty or fifty thousand lives for the maintenance of this Turkish Empire, in its constitution, its religion, in all its civil institutions—hostile to civilization and Christianity?

FINIS.

APPENDIX.

—o—

No. 1.

Sir Moses Montefiore the originator of the Relief Committee in aid of the Christian Sufferers of Syria, in the disturbances of 1860.

In 1829 my first work, an account of travels in the East, the result of four years' sojourn in Turkey, Syria, and Egypt, was published, and inscribed to Sir Moses Montefiore. In the interval between my earliest acquaintance in the East with Sir Moses in 1827, and the renewal of it in the same region in 1840, when I accompanied him on his mission of beneficence on behalf of the persecuted Jews of Damascus, the subject of Turkey and its institutions largely engaged my attention.

In 1840 the co-religionists of Sir Moses were persecuted by the Turks, instigated, I am sorry to say, by Christians of that city of Damascus, then, as it now is, the centre of all fanaticisms. A third and last visit of mine to the East, in the autumn of 1860, has shewn me very plainly that the fierce intolerance manifested in 1840 on the part of Christians, which brought Turkish brutality to bear on the Jews, has now directed its savagery, and that too of its most ferocious character, against the Christians of Damascus and the Lebanon.

I had occasion, in a work which I published in 1841, in relation to Egypt and Mohammed Ali, to speak of that unsectarian spirit of philanthropy which I have had so many opportunities

of seeing displayed by Sir Moses; and also to recall the generous impulses of one always prompt to act, and feel in unison with him when good was to be done, or suffering to be alleviated; one whose daily life and practical religion ever seemed to me to be an exemplification of the sense of duty comprehended in the words of our great dramatic moralist—

"We are born to do benefits."

These observations have been elicited, and the reminiscences of past years connected with them vividly recalled, by a document in relation to the recent Syrian massacres, and the part taken by Sir Moses on that occasion, which has been very lately brought to my knowledge. The document I speak of is very worthy of being noticed in this work, which treats so extensively of the Syrian massacres.

On the 10th of May, 1860, the first intimation of the cruel sufferings of upwards of 20,000 human beings in Syria, the survivors of the late massacres, was made in this country in the House of Lords.

On the following day that intimation came to the knowledge of Sir Moses Montefiore. Knowing well, as he did, the country where these horrible occurrences had taken place, and the condition of the people who had escaped the carnage, bereft of everything—home, friends, food, and clothing—he realized at once the whole amount of suffering that was caused, and the vast proportions of the calamity that needed to be fully comprehended, to be relieved. Deeply moved by these considerations, and greatly agitated by them—he was heard by one, to whom I have above referred—thinking aloud, and giving expression in exclamations rather than in distinct terms or observations, to the horror he felt, and the conviction forced upon him that something must be done in relation to the sufferings he had just read of, and that amiable person, whose good offices on all similar occasons I have referred to, said:—"Lose no time in taking some step to raise funds to relieve those poor Christians

of Syria." The step was instantly taken—the right step in the right time, and the right place. The following day, before any Christian project or proposal was announced to obtain funds and procure relief for the Syrian sufferers, the following communication was published in the *Times* newspaper :—

THE CIVIL WAR IN SYRIA.

(*To the Editor of The Times.*)

SIR,—I have noticed with the deepest sympathy the statement made last evening in the House of Lords, that owing to the recent out-break in Syria, there are 20,000 of the Christian inhabitants, women and children, wandering over its mountains exposed to the utmost peril. Being intimately acquainted with the nature of that country and the condition of its people, I appreciate, I am sorry to say, but too painfully the vast amount of misery that must have been endured, and which is still prevalent.

I believe that private benevolence may do something towards the alleviation of the distress of the unhappy multitude now defenceless, homeless, and destitute.

I well know from experience, the philanthropy of my fellow-men, and I venture to think that the public would gladly, and without delay contribute to the raising of a fund, to be applied as circumstances may require and under judicious management, for the relief of these unfortunate objects of persecution.

I would suggest, therefore, that a small, active, and influential committee be at once formed, with the view of raising subscriptions, and of placing themselves in communication with the British consular authorities throughout Syria, so that assistance may be rendered by the remittance of money and the transmission of necessary supplies, and I take the liberty of enclosing my check for £200 towards the proposed fund.

Your recent eloquent and judicious advocacy of the cause of

the Syrian Christians has encouraged me to address you, and will, I trust, be a sufficient excuse for my so doing.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Yours faithfully,
MOSES MONTEFIORE.

East Cliff Lodge, Ramsgate,
July, 11th, 1860.

The committee so timely suggested by Sir Moses was appointed, and the following extract from a letter of the chairman, to the Consul-General of Beyrout, will show in what a spirit of fairness, singleness, and earnestness of purpose the proceedings of that body were carried into effect:—

Extract of a letter from Sir C. E. Eardley to Mr. N. Moore, Consul General, Beyrout; dated 27th July, 1860.

"The Committee desire that relief may be afforded, without distinction of sect or party, to all parties suffering distress in consequence of the disturbances; and are instructed to express a wish that the money may be so administered as to prevent the possibility of its being thought that this Committee takes any part between the contending parties, or pronounces any opinion upon the origin of these unhappy events."

Thirty thousand pounds was soon collected by that committee, the great bulk of that sum has been distributed, and now at the close of its labors a balance of about fifteen hundred pounds remains; which some parties, happily few in number, erroneously consider should be applied to the promotion of purposes connected with the proselytizing labours of certain religious institutions in the East. But I would beg leave most respectfully to assure the members of that truly benevolent committee, my information leaves me in no doubt whatsoever as to the existence still of a vast amount of suffering in Syria that has not been relieved, and that stands in urgent need of charitable assistance.

No 2

The Number of Believers in Mohammedanism and Buddhism.

The number of believers in the Koran can only be estimated by conjecture. The most conflicting statements have been made on this subject. In Bossuet's time it was calculated by a very learned writer that the area of the countries which professed Mohammedanism exceeded by one-fifth those in which Christianity was believed. (See Brerewood's Inquiries touching diversity of languages and religions. Lond., 1674, p. 144). It is easier to judge of the extent of Mohammedan countries than of the extent of their population. In 1839 Sharon Turner estimated the Mohammedan population of the world at 80 millions. Dr. Eliotson in 1840 considered that population exceeded 122 millions; while according to Mr. Wilkin (see note to a passage in Sir Thomas Brown's works), there were 188,000,000 of Mohammedans distributed over the old world.

Buddhism owns far more followers than Mohammedanism, vast as the amount of believers is in the law of Islam. It would be well for the Christian proselytizing institutions of our country, whose labours are mainly directed to the conversion of Christians, not in all respects believing in the dogmas of the particular church or sect, the members of that institution belong to, to consider the vast field there is for their exertions in those immense regions of the globe, in which Buddhism and Mohammedanism prevail, and Christianity can scarcely be said to exist.

We are told by an eminent writer of well known accuracy in his statements, Sir James Emerson Tennent, in his work on Ceylon (vol. 1, p. 524), that Buddhism can boast of no less followers than 350 millions of the human race. "Looking (says Sir James) to its influence at the present day over at least three hundred and fifty millions of human beings, ex-

ceeding one-third of the human race, it is no exaggeration to say that the religion of Buddha is the most widely diffused that now exists, or that ever has existed since the creation of mankind."

To form any useful idea of the preceding estimates it would be desirable to have some corresponding data as to the population of the five great divisions of the nations of the globe.

A professor of eminence of the Berlin University has been recently making some remarkable researches respecting the population of the globe. The following is the result:—"Population of Europe, 372,000,000; of Asia, 720,000,000; of America, 200,000,000; of Africa, 89,000,000; of Australia, 2,000,000; total population of the globe, 1,283,000,000.

No. 3.

Turkish Sultans.

1.	Othman I. began to reign . .	1300
2.	Orchan	1326
3.	Amurath	1350
4.	Bajazet I.	1390
4.	Mahomet I.	1405
6.	Amurath II.	1422
7.	Mahomet II.	1450
8.	Bajazet II.	1481
9.	Selim I.	1512
10.	Soliman I., The Magnificent .	1520
11.	Selim II.	1566
12.	Amurath III.	1574
13.	Mahomet III.	1603
14.	Achmet I.	1610
15.	Mustapha I, (Deposed) . .	1617
16.	Othman II. (Mustapha restored for some months)	1621

17.	Amurath IV.	1623
18.	Ibrahim	1640
19.	Mahomet IV.	1649
20.	Soliman II.	1687
21.	Achmet II.	1691
22.	Mustapha II.	1695
23.	Achmet III.	1702
24.	Mahmoud I.	1730
25.	Othman III.	1754
26.	Mustapha III	1757
27.	Abdul Hamid	1774
28.	Selim III.	1789
29.	Mustapha IV.	1807
30.	Mahmoud II.	1808
31.	Abdul Medjid	1839
32.	Abdul Azis	1861

No. 4.

The Crusades.

1st	Crusade	set on foot in	A. D. 1095.
2nd	ditto	ditto	1147.
3rd	ditto	ditto	1189.
4th	ditto	ditto	1197.
5th	ditto	ditto	1203.
6th	ditto	ditto	1216.
7th	ditto	ditto	1248.
8th	ditto	ditto	1270.
9th	ditto	ditto	1275.
10th	ditto	ditto	1394.

No. 5.

The Suez Canal Project.

In all probability M. Lesseps' project to unite the Mediterranean with the Red Sea by a canal would never have been heard of, if Colonel Chesney's project had not been likely, some years previously, to have been carried into execution, to open a communication with India, and had the colonel not fixed on the valley of the Orantes at the foot of the Lebanon to unite the Euphrates with the Mediterranean.

A few years ago it was also proposed in England to connect the Persian Gulph with the Mediterranean, by a line of railway running along the valley of the Euphrates. The scheme was perhaps likely to benefit England, by bringing her nearer to her Indian possessions, but in a mercantile point of view the advantages were extremely doubtful. The projectors calculated on this line engrossing a third of the present Indian maritime trade of the countries bordering on the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, yielding a revenue estimated at £830,000. The Persian trade, which at present takes the Trebezonde route, it was supposed would yield £400,000. The present traffic between Bassorah and Bagdad would yield a profit of £74,000, and the grain produce of Babylonia would be so augmented by the railway facility of carriage, *it was supposed*, as to produce a revenue of £662,000. The preceding items would be increased, it was calculated by £1,118,400 for the transport of 400,000 passengers per annum, thus making a total of £3,084,800 sterling. Such magnificent railway results in the gorgeous East are splendid objects *on paper*, and no prospectuses indeed can be more plausible.

A less splendid programme, but "a more sober scheme," is set forth in a report of Mr. Consul Skene to his government in 1858—namely, the construction of a macadamized road, that

would connect the Euphrates with the Mediterranean—a distance of 150 miles, a project that might be accomplished by local enterprise *assisted by British capital*, if such assistance were possible. The navigation of the Euphrates is encumbered with difficulties in the early part of its course, so as to be scarcely navigable for large boats till it reaches Nitt, 500 miles lower than the proposed line of junction. The Euphrates presents the anomaly of a great river running through most fertile countries, in which all the energies of the people are crushed: and very limited cultivation is carried on in consequence of the rapacious tyranny of Turkish rule, and the total want of any protection to industry afforded by it.

In Egypt the railway from Alexandria to Cairo had just been completed. Another railway, from Cairo to Suez (since completed), was then in embryo. A railway in European Turkey (since completed also), was then projected.

Opening of the first Turkish Railway.

The "Times" correspondent writes under date of Oct. 4, 1860, from Kustendjie:—

The opening of the first railway in Turkey was celebrated this day. In 1857, certain gentlemen obtained the concession by virtue of which the Danube and Black Sea Railway has been called into existence. Tchernavoda, or, as the Turks call it, Boghaskeui, on the Danube, and Kustendjie, on the coast of the Black Sea, are names probably unknown to the majority of your readers.

From Tchernavoda, where the Danube makes a great detour to the north in order to discharge its waters by the mouths which have formed the subject of so much discussion, to Kustenjie, on the coast some 90 miles northward of Varna, is a distance of about 40 miles. From Tchernavoda to Kustendjie by the Sulina mouth it is fully 300 miles. It follows, there-

fore, that a person coming down the Danube to Constantinople or the Levant would save something like 260 miles by availing himself of the railway. This is not the only advantage. The navigation of the Lower Danube is uncertain, and delays constantly occur owing to want of water on the bar. This consideration applies with tenfold force to the conveyance of grain. The captain of any vessel who has once received a cargo of grain in the Danube for conveyance to Western Europe, will bear testimony to the dangers and delays involved in the passage of the Sulina mouth. Could he but receive his cargo in a safe port in the Black Sea, he would be content to make a great reduction from the amount of his freight. Shipper and shipowner would alike benefit by the change. It was to effect this object that the Danube and Black Sea Railway was designed. Hitherto I have made mention of the railway alone. The construction of this would, however, not suffice. The port of lading must be safe, and the western shores of the Black Sea offer but few places of refuge from a storm. The bay at the northern entrance to which the village of Kustenjie is situate, affords no shelter from north-easterly, and but little from south-easterly gales. It was ascertained, however, that a mole of 600 yards in length, projected from the northern shore of the bay in the direction of the opposite headland, would form an efficient guarantee against every contingency.

A small portion only of this mole has up to this moment been constructed; but already there is a safe anchorage for several vessels.

Now that the railway is opened, the works of the port will be pushed on with additional vigour, and there seems every reason to believe that in a very short time vessels of a large size will be able to receive their cargoes, which will be shot into them directly from the railway carriages, in perfect security.

The construction of the line of railway presented one difficulty, which many pronounced serious, some insurmountable. In order to avoid a great deal of heavy and expensive cutting, it

was necessary to carry the line through a valley which extends from Tchernavoda for some twenty five miles in the direction of Kustendjie. This valley which averages a mile in breadth, was subject to inundation in the spring, when the waters of the Danube attain their highest level. During the greater part of the year the whole extent of country thus situate was little better than a mere morass.

The engineers of the company had, however, seen their way out of the difficulty. Notwithstanding the doubts expressed on every side they never wavered, and two years ago they threw up a dam on the bank of the Danube at Tchernavado, across the ravine through which the floods made their way into the valley.

Several directors of the company arrived here in the course of the week (of which company Sir S. Cunard is chairman). On their way out to this country the directors concluded arrangements with the Danube Steam Navigation company, the Austrian Lloyd Company, and the railway companies on the route, by virtue of which after the beginning of next year the voyage from Constantinople to London may be performed in six days, in lieu of nine, which is the time occupied in travelling by the present routes.

No contractor has been employed by the company. The resident engineers themselves have carried on every foot of the works, and have brought the line to the verge of completion for the sum of £250,000, which is all that has been hitherto expended in the works of the railway and port. The various English railway projects and proposed canal undertakings in the Turkish Empire, evidently called into existence the grand French project to connect the Red Sea with the Mediterranean.

If the projected Maritime Canal of the Isthmus of Suez should fail of being carried into effect, it will not be from any want of ability and energy on the part of M. F. de Lesseps in writing up the undertaking.

The first work on this subject, entitled "The Isthmus of Suez

Question," Par M. F. de Lesseps, Minister Plenipotentiary, was published in England in 1855.

The second English publication on this subject, edited by the same author, appeared in 1856, entitled "New Facts and Figures relative to the Suez Canal, with a Reply of M. B. de S. Hilaire to the Edinburgh Reviewers." The Editor is styled in this work also, Minister Plenipotentiary.

The third publication in relation to the project of the Suez Canal, is entitled "Percement de l'Isthme de Suez, Rapport et projet de la Commission Internationale, avec documents Publiès par M. F. de Lesseps." Paris, 1856. In this work the author has omitted in the title-page the qualification found in the two preceding works, of "Minister Plenipotentiary."

The fourth, and latest publication of M. de Lesseps, on the same subject, is an English version of "The Report of the International Commission, with Appendix containing latest Official Documents." London, 1857.

M. de Lesseps, in 1855, in his work entitled "The Isthmus of Suez Question, states that—"In October, 1854, he left Europe for Egypt in consequence of an invitation he had from the Viceroy, Said Pacha, who for twenty years had honoured him, M. de Lesseps, with his friendship. He accordingly proceeded to Egypt, but had no mission from his government. It was in the course of a journey from Alexandria to Cairo, the idea of cutting through the Isthmus of Suez was for the first time mooted between them. M. de Lesseps does not say by whom the project was first mooted. The Pacha called on him to draw up a memorial on the subject, which memorial, meeting with his approval, he issued a firman destined to receive the sanction of the Sultan, granting to a Company, to be composed of the capitalists of all Nations, the right to construct a canal between the two seas. M. de Lesseps, assisted by two eminent civil engineers in his service—Linant Bey and Mougel Bey—was dispatched to Suez on an exploring expedition, in Dec., 1854. The result of his renewed examinations, and those

of the civil engineers, was a report to the Vice Roy, setting forth the practicability of a maritime canal from Suez to Pelusium, thirty leagues long, one hundred metres wide, and eight metres deep* extending sufficiently far into the two seas by means of jetties to obtain the depth neccessary to enable ships to enter without difficulty, having an inland port in the natural basin of Lake Timsah, and which should be completed in six years, and would cost 160 millions of francs or £6,400,000 sterling.

[But in a subsequent work on the same subject, we find the International Commission, in its report, have raised the maximum to 200,000,000 of francs or £8,000,000 sterling.

M. de Lesseps says, when he announced his project in the principal money markets of Europe and in England especially, he reckoned confidently on support, and particularly at the hands of British commercial enterprise, and that he expected also encouragement and co-operation at the hands of British statesmen.

He could not believe it possible it would be discouraged by the British government for the following reasons:—

1st. England transacts more than half the general commerce with India and China; she has an immense empire in Asia; she may reduce by one third the charges in her commerce, and bring that Eastern empire nearer to her own island by one half. Therefore, England had more to gain by this project than all the other nations together.

2nd. The exports of England to the East will be enormously increased by the proposed maritime canal.

After a little time M. de Lesseps discovered that he had formed an erroneous opinion with respect to the expected

* Equivalents in English monies, weights, and measures of those of France referred to by M. de Lesseps.

1 Franc = about 9½d., or 25 francs = 1 pound sterling.
1 Quintal = about 220½ English lbs.
1 Metre = 39⅜ inches English, nearly.
1 Kilometre = about 1093⅔ yards, or nearly 5 furlongs.
1 Hectare = nearly 2½ acres.
1 Litre= about 1¾ pints.

encouragement for his project at the hands of British statesmen. He was forced to believe that apprehensions were conscientiously entertained by them. 1st, that shortening the distance to India by three thousand leagues for all the countries of Northern Europe, and by 3,400 leagues on an average for the parts of the Mediterranean, might not in future, in case of war, menace the safety of the British possessions in India.

2nd. That the commercial and maritime relations of Great Britain might be disadvantageously affected by the opening of the new route, which, while shortening the distance for her own navigation, would, at the same time facilitate and increase the navigation of all other nations towards the extreme east; and, further, that as Venice lost her power by the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope, England might see hers decline by a return to the shortest route to India.

M. de Lesseps, however, affects to make light of these difficulties, and to rely on "public opinion, which is so powerful in England, dealing justly with interested opposition to this great project, and those superannuated objections" to it.

In a memorial to the Viceroy of Egypt, dated November, 1854, M. de Lesseps observes:—

"The junction of the Mediterranean and the Red Seas, by a navigable canal, is an undertaking the utility of which has attracted the attention of all the great men who have reigned in, or conquered Egypt: Sesostris, Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, the Arab Conqueror Amrou, Napoleon I., and Mehemet Ali.

"A canal communicating with the Nile was in existence in ancient times; first, for a period of 100 years, down to about the middle of the ninth century before the Hegira; secondly, for a period of 445 years, from the reign of the first successors of Alexander the Great, down to about the fourth century before the Hegira; thirdly and lastly, for a period of 130 years after the Arabian conquest.

"Napoleon, upon his arrival in Egypt, immediately organized a commission of engineers to ascertain whether it would

be possible to re-establish that ancient channel of navigation; the question was resolved in the affirmative, and when the learned M. Lepère delivered to him the report of the commission, on the eve of his return to France, he said:—'It is an important affair; it is not in my power to accomplish it, but the Turkish Government will perhaps one day owe its preservation and its glory to the execution of this project.'

"Lebeau in his 'Histoire du Bas Empire' (Vol. 12, p. 490), following the Arabian Historian and Geographer, who flourished in the 14th century, says:—'The coast at Farma (a town a little to the east of Pelusiam, on the Mediterranean), was only seventy miles (106,000 metres) distant from the Red Sea. This space was a very smooth plain, slightly elevated above the level of the two seas. Amron formed the design of uniting them by a canal, which he would have filled with the waters of the Nile; but Omar having opposed it from fear of opening an entrance into Arabia for the ships of the Christians, Amron turned his thoughts in another direction. There was an ancient canal called Trajanus Amnis, which Adrian caused to be brought from the Nile, near to Babylon in Egypt, as far as Pharboëtus, now Belbeis. He met at this place with another canal, commenced by Nechos, and continued by Darius Hystaspes, and the two together discharged themselves into a lagoon of salt water, at the outlet of which Ptolemy Philadelphus caused a large trench to be made, which conducted the waters as far as the town of Arsinoë, or Cleopatris, at that part of the gulf where Suez now is.

"The whole of this canal, being filled up with sand, had become useless at the time of the famous Cleopatra. Amron was not deterred by the ancient prejudice, which, supposing the waters of the Red Sea to be higher than the soil of Egypt, created a fear of opening a passage for them, and he made it navigable for the transport of the corn of Egypt into Arabia. It is that which is now called Khalig, which passes through Cairo, but it only goes as far as the lagoon, called the Lake of

Sheib. The remainder, as far as the Red Sea, is entirely filled up, although some traces of it are still distinguishable.'

"We have thought it necessary to quote the entire passage, because it clearly establishes the question of the canal, and certain facts to which we shall return hereafter.

"After Amron came Sultan Mustapha III., *who took great interest in the scheme for the junction of the two seas by the Isthmus of Suez;* and who intended to execute this work in a time of peace. (See *Mémoires sur les Turcs*, by M. de Tott, Parts iii. and iv.)

"M. Lepère proposed, it is true, the track of the secondary canal between Alexandria and the interior of Egypt; but his opinion upon the direct track by the Isthmus of Suez, is expressed in these terms:—

"'In this project of the canal of Suez, we have expressly based the choice of the ancient direction by the interior of the Delta, towards Alexandria, upon commercial considerations peculiar to Egypt, and upon the fact that the coast near Pelusium does not appear to allow of a permanent maritime establishment. Nevertheless, we think it right to acknowledge that, waiving these considerations, it would still be easy (although, on the contrary, it appeared difficult, and even dangerous, before the invention of locks) to open a direct communication between Suez, the Bitter Lakes, and the Ras-el-Moyeh, continued upon the eastern bank of the Lake Menzaleh, as far as the sea, near Pelusium.

"'We think that a canal opened in this direction would have an advantage *which the interior canal would not.* In fact there might be constant navigation upon it, which would not be subject to the alteration of the rising and decreasing of the Nile. It would be easy to maintain a greater depth in it than in the first canal, by means of a current, fed by the immense reservoir of the Bitter Lakes. . . . I will add, that if I did not perceive some difficulties in excavating and maintaining at a proper depth, the channel between Suez and the road-

stead, I would propose to establish a direct communication between the two seas by the Isthmus, for the use of corvettes, and even of frigates, which will become the complement of this grand and important operation.'

"It will be seen then (says M. de Lesseps), that M. Lepère himself acknowledged that the direct track was the most advantageous for the commerce of the world, while the interior canal was especially advantageous to Egypt. It is evident that with the two canals, the one direct on a large section, the other on a small section, and both derived from the Nile, all interests are most abundantly satisfied." . . .

"The advantage of the new track being thus sufficiently proved from a general point of view, we shall now enter into the details of the scheme, with regard to its execution. We will begin with the levelling of the line from Pelusium to Suez. These levels were taken by some engineers attached to the French expedition, and the difference between the level of high water at Suez, and of low water at Sineh, was found to be 9 met., 90, in favour of the Red Sea. Although this result has been explained by geological and historical considerations, the fact appeared so extraordinary, that several travellers came to the spot to verify it. Some English officers, amongst others, operating first with the barometer, and afterwards with the boiling water process, were not able to discover any perceptible difference between the levels of the two seas. These investigations, published in a pamphlet, which has come before us, and which were known to the learned world, had occasioned much uncertainty, when, in 1847, a society was established for the investigation of the Isthmus of Suez, and at the head of which were M. M. Négrelli, Robert Stephenson, and Talabot, and caused a complete survey to be made by French engineers, under the direction of M. Bourdaloue, well known for his improved methods of levelling, and his numerous labours in that particular branch. These able and experienced surveyors, provided with good instruments, and accompanied by a numerous staff, were

formed into several divisions, which operated separately, and thus were able to obtain divers verifications.

"M. Sabatier, Consul General of France in Egypt, having been informed of the wish of some learned Frenchmen to have a fresh verification, spontaneously applied to the Viceroy of Egypt, and one of us was appointed to undertake it in consequence.

"The verification was made in 1853. It resulted in favour of the surveyors of 1847. For the new levels only differ a fraction of a metre from those of 1847, and give as the difference between the station on the quay of the hotel at Suez, and low water in the Mediterranean two metres 4286, instead of two metres 6100, found by the operations in 1847.

"There cannot be a moment's hesitation in making choice between the levellings of 1799 and those of 1847 and 1853, for the two latter were taken under the most favorable circumstances by experienced surveyors provided with the best instruments, and were verified several times without finding any perceptible difference by these varions verifications; whilst the levelling of 1799 was undertaken in the midst of the vicissitudes and dangers of warfare, in a hostile country, and in a climate to which the engineers were not accustomed.

"Supposing, therefore, the bed of the canal to be established at the depth of six metres—50 below low water in the Mediterranean, the greatest excavation would be at the bar of *El Guisr*, and would show a total depth of 16 metres, 50, which is nothing extraordinary, supposing it even twenty metres. The requisite excavation would bear no comparison with what was executed in Mexico during the Spanish occupation."

The subject of the comparative levels of the Red Sea and Mediterranean is thus referred to, in the very able report of the International Commission, published in 1856.

"Since the operation of taking the level by M. Lepère in 1799, it has been generally admitted, for nearly half a century, that the Red Sea had an elevation about 9 metres, 908, at the

high tide at the sea at Suez above the level of the Mediterranean at Pelusium at ebb tide. When this result became known to the savans of Europe, at the beginning of this century, there were only a few superior minds, and those were small in number, who called it in question. Amongst those who protested against it were the great Laplace and the illustrious Fourier. Both did so on grounds purely theoretic, believing that the equilibrium of the waters on the surface of the globe did not admit of a possibility of this phenomena. Laplace had not been in Egypt. But Fourier took part in the Egyptian expedition, but not in the geometrical operations of its savans. The difference in the level of the two seas set forth by M. Lepère and his colleagues, was in perfect accordance with the tradition which had been accepted and transmitted down to their times from the highest antiquity. It came at least from the time of Aristotle, who, in his Meteorology (Lib. 1, cap. 14) had said that the Red Sea was higher than the soil of Egypt, and that Sesostris, who had commenced digging a canal, was obliged to cease that work, as at a later period Darius was obliged to do; because, fearing that the Red Sea when it came to mingle with the Nile, might not completely destroy the course of it. This idea has been often re-produced since the time of Aristotle, and it is not improbable that it had some influence on the erroneous conclusion that M. Lepère had come to.*

A few references to the sites of the ancient canals and the several localites made mention of by M. de Lesseps may not be misplaced here.

The first attempt to connect the Red Sea with the Mediterranean we are told by Herodotus was made by Sesostris.

In this attempt 100,000 lives were sacrificed, it is said.

Nechos consulted an oracle on the subject of the undertaking and the response might have come from Downing Street, if Downing Street had then been in existence. "The canal will open Egypt to the invasion of strangers."

* Percement de D'Isthme de Suez, par. M. F. de Lesseps. Paris, 1856.

The canal was completed, however, so far as to admit of merchandize being conveyed from the Nile to the Red Sea.

Trajan and the renowned Saracen, Amron, Caliph Omar's Egyptian Governor, re-opened the canal at intervals of about 500 years.

The only remains of it serviceable now is a small portion at Cairo called the Kalisch.

The level of the Red Sea up to a very late period was erroneously considered to be thirty feet higher than the Mediterranean, and fifteen feet higher than the Nile at the lowest period of the waters of that river at Cairo, and five feet lower than the Nile at its highest period.

The remains of the old canal on the borders of the Pelusiac mouth of the Nile are connected with sites of ancient cities renowned in Hebrew lore.

Rae Wilson has erroneously described Mansoura, as the Zoan of the sacred volume; Danville, however, and Hamilton are good authorities, and they describe San as the site of the ancient Zoan.

"Samna," says Danville, "was the ancient Tanis; it took in the translation of the Septuagint made in Egypt, the name of Tzoan, from which San is derived."

"It is singular," says Hamilton, "that Josephus should designate in this way the ruins of a vast city, which had been rendered so conspicuous by the curses denounced against it by the prophets of his country, and fulfilled by the avenging hand of heaven. But it was now several centuries since the mighty Zoan had been levelled with the dust; and a scene of desolation had succeeded to the abundance and wealth of a metropolis." "It is mentioned in the Itineray of Antoine as being forty four miles from Pelusium, which seems to agree with the admeasurement lately made. Larcher, in his notes on the translation of Herodotus, has endeavoured to prove that the ancient name of Tanis is only applicable to the Island of Thennesus, notwithstanding that the Hebrew Zoan is uniformly rendered Tanis in the Septuagint.

That it was an ancient city we have the testimony of the Scriptures. "Now Hebron was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt."

"It was here," says Hamilton, "the Pharaohs had their splendid palaces; it was here that Moses performed his miracles before them; 'Marvellous things did he in the sight of their father in the land of Egypt in the field of Zoan;' and here in the vicinity of Salehie, lay that pasture land which was the Goshen of the Hebrews."

Bryant in speaking of the space between the Pelusiac branch and the Red Sea, says, "The Jews who during their captivity betook themselves to this country, thought it no despicable spot to settle in."

The country between San and Salehie, now on the verge of the desert, was probably the Goshen of the Hebrews. The interest excited by controversies on this subject, and that also of the channel of the ancient canal from Suez to the Nile determines a route of mine nearly thirty five years ago by Salehie and Pelusium to Suez. "That San is the site of that Zoan where Moses performed the miracles before Phoraoh, and that the Israelites took their departure from that city, and journied through that desert, on the verge of which their Goshen was situated, is taken for granted by some of our best informed travellers. When the children of Israel journied from Rameses to Succoth, "about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children," their route it is supposed was from San to Salehie fifteen miles from Zoan: and from thence to the vicinity of the modern Suez. The first account of their arrival at the Red Sea is when they "encamp at Pihahiroth, betwen Migdol and the sea, over against Baalzephon."*

After waiting at San three days for our Bedouin guides, they at last arrived; and at five the next morning we set out for Suez.

Elsewhere I have given an account of a journey of mine to

* Madden's Travels in the East, vol. ii., p. 180.

Suez, and of the remains of the ancient canal and its vicinity, at a period when railway travelling was not in being in the land of the Pharaohs.

"At the extremity of the Gulf of Suez, five or six miles from the town, I observed a portion of the remains of the ancient canal which joined the Nile: the bank on the eastern side is from eight to ten feet high, and the breadth of the canal appears to have been thirty feet; it runs north north-west, and, on the route from Salehie, its course may be traced for half a day in that direction. The Saline marshes which extend fifteen or eighteen miles from Suez, in the direction of Salehie, mark its bed. Hamilton thought he saw the termination of this canal in the Nile, near Belbeis, and Burckhardt has laid down its course in the direction of Belbeis, but I believe it terminated in the Pelusiac branch of the Nile near Salehie; for here, on the left of our route, towards Suez, I found the bed of an ancient canal, much wider than any of the modern ones; and, as I could trace its course in a southerly direction for about fifty yards, I thought it very probable that it was the continuation of the canal from Suez. It is supposed its course, in Burckhardt's map, is too much to the west; instead of turning off towards Belbeis, it should be traced north north-west, in the direction of Salehie.

Strabo speaks of this canal falling into the Pelusiac branch of the Nile, and of its being anterior to the siege of Troy; other authors ascribed its construction to Necho, and its perfection to one of the Ptolemies.*

The *Lake Muzale* is only five miles distant from Damietta, and the voyage to *San* is commonly accomplished in two days.

The ancient geography of *Menzalé*, and its vicinity in the Delta, is of so much importance in determining the site of the canal from Suez to the Nile, and more especially the spot where Zoan stood, that it may not be amiss to mention the

* Madden's Travels in the East, vol. 2, p. 227.

modern canals and outlets which mark the seven ancient branches of the Nile.

The Canal of Kelioub marks the Pelusiac Branch.

The Canal of Moes marks the Tanitic do.

The Canal of Ashmoum marks the Mendesian do.

The Canal of Bebek Bourlos marks the Sebennytic do.

The Bogaz of Damietta marks the Phatnitic do.

The Bogaz of Rosetta marks the Bolbitine do.

The old Canal of Aboukir marks the Canopic do.

Of these, two only of the original mouths are now remaining, —the Damietta and Rosetta branches. The French found the extreme length of the lake to be forty-three thousand fathoms, and its extreme width twelve thousand, But from my own observation of the time required to traverse it, I should judge it to be sixty-five miles long and fifteen broad.*

The lake *Menzalé*, properly speaking, is not a maritime lake, but formed by the increase of the Damietta branch of the Nile,† at the expense of the *Tanitic* and *Mendesian* branches; and thereby, the sea having no opposition to its passage through the dry channels of the latter branches; the depth of the lake is from three to five feet, and on pushing an oar to the bottom, I have observed it coated with the common mud of the Nile, for about twenty inches deep.

About twelve miles from Metariéh, we entered the canal of *Moes*, which takes the name of *Meshrah* for six miles; about five miles more from the mouth, the canal is dammed up to prevent the influx of the salt water of the lake.‡

So much for the sites of the old canals referred to by M. de Lesseps.

On the first report of the international commissioners, the Viceroy confirmed the first concession to M. de Lesseps by a second charter, dated 30th November, 1854, on ascertaining that the Porte would raise no obstacle to the undertaking.

* Madden's Travels in the East, Vol. ii. p. 170.

† Herodotus says, the Damietta branch, was dug by the inhabitants.

‡ Madden's Travels in the East, Vol. ii. p. 175.

The next step of M. de Lesseps was the organization of resources for the project. He tells us, in his work, published in 1856, that "a number of capitalists in the Ottoman Empire, in Germany, Italy, Holland, France, Spain, and Belgium, had offered to advance the scheme by advances, the amount of which was already more than sufficient for its requirements."

But there is no mention made of any advances, or prospect of any assistance at the hands of British capitalists. M. de Lesseps could not, however, avoid recognising the considerable amount of cold water that was generously contributed in the British Press, in Parliament, and in official publications in our Blue Books, and thrown unsparingly on the scheme of the Suez Maritime Canal, by a French projector.

When the scheme was approved and adopted by Said Pacha, "a concession" was formally given to M. de Lesseps, coupled with certain remarkable conditions, one of which, must have largely, or rather mainly contributed to the determination come to by the international commissioners, to the following effect:—

"After having passed in review the numerous projects submitted to various governments, or to the public for more than fifty years, I grant perfect liberty for the application of those means that science shall recognise to be best to bring the Red Sea and the Mediterranean into communication, at any point of the Isthmus, eastward of the course of the Nile; but I declare that I will not authorise the Grand Maritime Suez Canal Company, to adopt any track which shall have its point of departure on the Mediterranean coast, to the west of the Damietta branch, and which shall traverse the course of the Nile."

By the terms of the Firman of Concession, granted to M. de Lesseps in 1854, by the Viceroy of Egypt.

1. Mr. Lesseps is charged with the formation of a Company for the construction of the Maritime Canal.

2. The Director of the Company is to be always appointed by the Egyptian Government.

3. The term of the grant is for 99 years from the date of opening the Canal.

4. The works to be executed at the cost of the Company. The necessary land required for the Canal and Ports, not belonging to private persons, to be granted by the Government, free of cost. The fortifications the Government may think proper to erect, to be at the cost of Government.

5. The Government to receive from the Company annually 15 per cent. of the nett profits.

6. The tariff of dues for the passage of the Canal of Suez, to be regulated by the government and the agents between the Company and theVice Roy.

7. In case the Company see fit to connect the Nile with the Maritime Canal, the Viceroy would give up to the Company the uncultivated government lands, that shall be irrigated and cultivated by the Company for ten years, free of taxation.

8. The land required for the Maritime Canal, and the branch one connecting it with the Nile, not to be made objects of speculation.

9. The Company shall be allowed to use all mines and quarries of the public domain, for the works of the Canal and erections connected with it, and shall be exempted from dues on the importation of all machines and materials.

10. At the expiration of the term of the grant, the Egyptian Government to take the place of the Company, and to enjoy all the rights of the latter. The plant and moveables to be taken by agreement or arbitration.

11. The statutes of the company must be submitted to the government, and have its sanction and approbation.

12. The Viceroy will give his true co-operation and that of all the functionaries of Egypt to the undertaking.

The works not to commence until they are authorised by the Porte.

Alexandria, May, 19, 1855.

In M. de Lesseps's memorial, in 1854, to the Viceroy of Egypt, setting forth the advantages of the projected maritime canal, a table is given shewing the comparative distances between several European ports and Bombay *via* Suez, and by the long sea

voyage through the Straits of Gibraltar, and the saving by the Suez maritime canal route.

PORTS. From	DISTANCE TO BOMBAY IN LEAGUES. *Viâ* Suez.	*Viâ* Cape of Good Hope.	DIFFERENCE. Distance saved.
London	5,950	3,100	2,850
Trieste	5,960	2,340	3,620
St. Petersburg ...	6,550	3,700	2,850
Marseilles	5,650	2,374	3,276
Amsterdam	5,950	3,100	2,850
Lisbon	5,350	2,500	2,850
Constantinople ...	6,100	1,800	4,300

In the second English publication of M. de Lesseps, published in 1856, a table is given of the distances in marine miles (of 1852 metres), between the principal commercial ports of Europe and America to Ceylon, as more justly to be considered a central port for the Indian and Chinese seas, from which the following data are taken:—

PORTS. From	DISTANCE TO CEYLON IN MILES. *Viâ* Cape of Good Hope.	*Viâ* Suez	DIFFERENCE. Distance saved.
London	14,340	7,300	7,040
Trieste	15,480	5,220	10,260
St. Petersburg ...	15,660	8,620	7,040
Marseilles	14,500	5,490	9,010
Amsterdam	14,460	7,420	7,040
Lisbon	13,500	6,190	7,310
Constantinople ...	15,630	4,700	10,930

In the second English publication, edited by M. de Lesseps, "Minister Plenipotentiary," that appeared in 1856, entitled "New Facts and Figures relative to the Suez Canal, with a reply of M. B. de St. Hilaire, to the Edinburgh Reviewers," we are informed that M. de Lesseps invited the civil engineers of the principal European nations to form an international Commission of Inquiry, to examine on the spot the several projects for the accomplishment of the proposed undertaking. A commission was accordingly appointed, in which it is said the engineering science of England, France, Austria, Prussia, Italy, Holland and Belgium were represented.

The commissioners met in Paris in Oct. 1855, and it was determined that a majority of the members should proceed to Egypt.

In Dec. 1855 the commissioners commenced their inquiries and examinations at Suez, and terminated them at Pelusium. The results of their labours are the following conclusions, which M. de Lesseps says, "The scientific world may henceforth look upon as ascertained facts."

The bay or gulph of Pelusium has undeservedly been always held in bad repute. The sea of mud, which is said to exist there, "is a perfect chimera," the waters are limped, the shore is composed of fine smooth sand. At three miles' distance from the beach no trace of mud was to be found, and no mud banks were in existence, which, it had been asserted confidently, did exist, and must render navigation impossible in these inhospitable waters. The commissioners spent a month examining the bay and the coast of Pelusium, taking soundings with great care and accuracy. The Gulph of Pelusium facing the north-east is 60 kilometres in breadth and 20 in depth, and is bordered by a narrow belt of fine sand, not moveable, which during the memory of man has not undergone any material change in form. In advance of this narrow sand belt out at sea there is a zone of fine sand similar to that on the beach, and ending at a depth of about 10 metres, "*at which point commences an immense bed of* mud, advancing far into the depths of the sea. The bottom has throughout a regular slope, and gradual inclination. Its greatest inclination is facing the height of Tennis, where a depth of 8 metres exists at a distance of 2300 metres from the beach. To the west it continues much the same as far as Damietta, but eastward it sensibly diminishes up to Pelusium, where a depth of 8 metres is not found until 7,500 metres from the shore. Winds from the W.N.W. prevail two-thirds of the year, and in winter are the most violent. The currents are nearly imperceptible. *The deposits of sand in the Gulph of Pelusium are as ancient as the Nile itself, and yet their increase during the lapse of ages is inappreciable.*

"From all these observations, it becomes evident that in forming a harbour in the Gulph of Pelusium, there would be nothing to fear from accumulations brought by the waters of the Nile."

The only cause for apprehension would be in the shifting sands driven in various directions by storms from the N. W. and N.E. But this danger is to be obviated by carrying out the entrance to the harbour as far as the belt of mud.

The materials for the construction of the harbour would have to be brought along the shores of Syria, from the islands of Cyprus, Rhodes, or Scarpanto.

The commissioners returned to Alexandria, and from Pelusium to the former port the length of the voyage in the Egyptian frigate "the Nile" was twenty hours.

On their arrival at Alexandria, they reported to the Viceroy "That the direct canal from Pelusium to Suez was the only solution to the problem, and that there existed no other practical manner of joining the Red Sea with the Mediterranean; that the execution of this maritime canal was easy and its success certain. That the two harbours required to be constructed at Suez and Pelusium presented no difficulties but such as were of an ordinary character. The harbour at Suez would open on a spacious and safe roadstead, accessible in all weathers, and in which a depth of eight metres is found at 1,600 metres from the shore; that at Pelusium, being situated between the mouths of Oum Fareg and Oum Ghemilè, in a region where a depth of eight metres is found at 2,300 metres from the shore the bottom presents a good hold. Finally, the Commission declared that the total expense would not exceed the sum stated in the precursory scheme—200,000,000 of francs, or in sterling £6,400,000."

The Viceroy, at the time of his approval of the project, is made to appear a generous contributor to the great undertaking. "The Viceroy of Egypt," says M. de Lesseps, "was the first to come forward with a subscription to the amount of 30,000,000 of francs (upwards of a million sterling), and to subscribe an

additional two millions of francs as an investment for the benefit of the officers and soldiers of his army." If the tenth part of the amount *subscribed* by His Highness was actually paid down, the Viceroy of Egypt, in 1855, must have been in a happier position than he was in in 1860, when I was last in Egypt, to be able to subscribe 30,000,000 of francs for a project of very uncertain accomplishment, and to invest in it 2,000,000 for his army.

At the period of my visit, the payment of his army and his civil employés had been in arrear upwards of eighteen months, indeed his government was in a state of insolvency.

M. B. de St. Helaire, Member of the Institute of France, who accompanied the International Commission to Suez and Pelusium on the mission of inquiry and investigation, replying to an adverse article on M. de Lesseps's scheme, published in the "Edinburgh Review," of Jan. 1856, says, the two positions taken by the reviewer, which are specious, and need to be refuted, are the following :—

1st. That the proposed Maritime Canal is impracticable on account of the very great difficulties which must be encountered in the roadstead of Suez, and on account of the absolutely insurmountable difficulties which are presented in the Bay of Pelusium.

2nd. That even if the project were practicable and acually accomplished, it would be useless to commerce, because the Red Sea is very nearly impracticable to sailing vessels, and the saving in point of distance by means of the Maritime Canal, would be more than counterbalanced by the enormous obstacles which would have to be encountered in those seas.

It is not necessary in this place to refer either to the details of the Edinburgh Reviewer's objections, or M. St. Helaire's extensive refutations.

Objections to the Suez Canal Project.

In the summer of 1860 a very valuable paper was presented o the British Parliament in return to an order of the House of Commons, dated the 9th of Feb., 1860, intitled:

Extracts from an inquiry into the soundness of M. De Lesseps's Reasonings and Arguments on the practicability of the Suez Canal. By Captain T. Spratt, R.N., C.B., F.R.S.

The projects, we are told by Captain Spratt, embrace two classes of engineering works, viz.—the cutting a gigantic canal through the isthmus; and the formation of a sea-port or deep entrance into it, from a tideless and shallow sea, in the vicinity of one of the larger class rivers.

It is quite evident that this canal is dependent upon or secondary to the practicability of making and maintaining a deep entrance to it from the tideless Mediterranean.

And it is argued and asserted by M. de Lesseps, the great mover of this question, that the harbour on either side presents no difficulty that engineering skill cannot surmount, and consistent with its practicability as a commercial project.

Those arguments and reasonings are based upon one or two very extraordinary and important views, viz., that the sea coast of Egypt is now mainly, indeed entirely, the result of a maritime production, and consequently that the anciently apprehended difficulty respecting the filling up of any harbour formed to the eastward of the Nile, and so near to it as M. de Lesseps proposes, is not founded on a true knowledge of the local influences; although asserted so long ago as the days of Herodotus, when Egypt was both far more populous and far more enlightened than at this time, so that the founder of Alexandria was guided by the local opinions in respect to the proper position for the site of this city and port, that was intended to be the emporium of the world.

And all M. de Lesseps's arguments in consequence tend to

prove this assertion, by endeavouring to show that the accumulations on the shore of the Delta are now due to a sea origin only; and thus rendering the depositions of the mighty Nile as *nil*, or of none effect.

Much of this assertion may startle a reflecting mind who has at all studied the effect of rivers in other localities; much as it may startle also the geographer, geologist, and hydrographer, as a remarkable assertion to make in the middle of the nineteenth century, yet from the manner it has been discussed and treated in some of its points and facts connected with the local conditions, the reason seems to be in a measure sound: I mean on a superficial investigation of them.

Because the ruins of Pelusium seem to be not much farther removed from the sea than when Strabo wrote, and because the mouths of the Nile also have not advanced at any remarkable amount for such a river for many centuries.

But does this really prove that the Nile has ceased to exercise any influence on the shallows of the Bay of Pelusium or its adjacent coast?—for this is the real point of the question; and is such an apparent anomaly amongst rivers such a remarkable exception to the previously entertained laws of other rivers—the Danube, the Po, and as the Rhine, true?

Especially when it is so well known that Egypt owes its fertility to the annual depositions from the Nile to the more superficial and therefore lighter portions of its suspended matter; the heavier and grosser being of course rolled and carried along in the lower part of this great stream.

Such an assertion, then, is indeed startling, in the face of the entertained notions regarding the influences of rivers in all other parts of the world, and from the manner in which it has been argued by M. de Lesseps, it has been successfully received by the commercial communities of England, France, and Austria, who have been invited to risk their millions in the project, from thus believing it a remunerative and practicable undertaking, because apparently founded upon a profound and sound

knowledge of the local conditions and difficulties that are to be contended with.

Thus the argument and reasonings of M. de Lesseps go to prove that the coast of Africa and Egypt, from Tripoli to Syria, is composed of a similar alluvium, being covered with sand-banks, which owe their origin to the abrasion of the sea; but that from some unknown reason their originating causes have ceased to operate upon this coast, and this he endeavours to prove by the following passage, which seems to confirm his arguments, and to be the rock of his theory and project:—

"Now it appears that for many ages the sands have ceased to extend the Pelusiac shore, as is manifested from the well-ascertained position of Pelusium, the ruins of which still remain. Strabo, in his 'Itinerary,' says that Pelusium is situated at the distance of 20 stadia from the sea; the French engineers of the expedition have verified this distance by measuring 1,600 toises, or 3,000 metres, from its remains to the shore."

In 1847 the distance between these two points had not varied, as it is marked on the plan with the figure 3,000 metres, and at the present day it is still the same."

In fact, by reading all the accounts of ancient authors, and comparing them with what actually exists, we arrive at the conclusion that the shores of the Delta have varied very little in historic times."

The sea sands, then, have long ceased to accumulate, and the fact may be explained by assuming that the destruction of the coasts of Morocco, Algeria, Candia, and other parts, which destruction, we repeat, alone furnishes the materials of maritime alluvium, has abated, from some cause or other. It may also be assumed that the sands which were formerly driven by winds and currents into the Gulf of Pelusium, are now cast on the African coast, between Tripoli and Alexandria, and driven inland in the shape of downs.

The fact is that no new doons are now seen forming the Isthmus; those on the sea shore being of ancient formation,

and nearly all naturally fixed by vegetation. In conclusion, the extension of the Pelusiac shore, if such extension there be, is too insignificant to be taken into consideration.

Thus, by the assumptions of M. de Lesseps, the laws of nature are suspended, ancient opinions and apprehensions are denied, modern experience also set at naught, because the shore at Pelusium has apparently advanced but little on the sea since the days of Strabo.

Surely a project involving the expenditure of eight or ten millions is not to be based upon such assumptions or assertions. For they are not, in my humble judgment and experience, a true solution of the question, or a true investigation of nature, or founded on sound reasonings. . . .

On inspecting a chart of the coast, it will be seen also that the coast and shallows off Alexandria are for the most part rocky and not sandy, as M. de Lesseps states, and so is the greater part of the coast to the westward as far as Cyrene, being formed of rocky headlands and a rocky shore line, that are the roots or salient prongs of mountain ranges.

For Alexandria, or rather Abou-kir Castle, stands upon the termination of this rocky shore, which once no doubt jutted out into the sea as a long peninsula of land, being elevated from 50 to 100 feet above it.

And immediately off, and to the westward of Alexandria, the sea is deep; there being upwards of 100 feet depth at only two miles distance from the shore, whilst off the bay of Pelusium that depth does not exist nearer than twenty miles, so that this fact at once indicates that in advancing to the westward of the Nile we are departing from the true origin of these vast shallows and sand-banks which extend off the coast, and form the Suez Isthmus and Nile Delta.

Thus the coast abrasion theory of M. de Lesseps is at fault, an evident fallacy at the first step of the investigation on the line from whence he attributes the ancient origin of these accumulations, viz., from Tripoli and Morocco.

It is necessary and just to the commercial interest desiring

to embark in the project of M. de Lesseps to know these important facts ere they risk their millions in the undertaking, instead of discovering them only when swamped in the sands they will have to contend against; and then to discover also, when too late to amend it, that Alexander the Great was wiser than M. de Lesseps admits, when he listened to the local opinion regarding the influence of the Nile upon his harbour, if formed to the eastward of it. At least, with all due deference to the judgment of that able gentleman, the above facts and my hydrographic experience of the Mediterranean, observes Captain Spratt, extending over a period of twenty years, teach me to believe so.

(Signed) T. Spratt,
Captain, R.N.

Malta, 30 January, 1858.

EXTRACTS from an Investigation of the Effect of the Prevailing Wave Influence on the Nile's Deposits, and upon the Littoral of its Delta.

By Captain Spratt, R.N.

The effect of the prevailing wave stroke on the littoral drift of matter discharged from the Nile's embouchures is undoubtedly a point of much importance in the consideration of the practicability of maintaining a harbour in Pelusium Bay. And conceiving, from my experience of the Delta of the Danube and elsewhere, that as the prevailing winds, and therefore the prevailing wave movement and currents on the coast of Egypt, are from the north-west and westward, the small extension of the shores of the delta to seaward is thus accounted for, in causing a littoral dispersion of the Nile's deposit of sand and mud, viz., to the eastward: and as far even as the shores of Syria, that is since the shores of the delta have advanced so far north as to be within reach of their influence. Consequently, that to the westward of the Nile, and so near to it as Alexandria, the Nile's influence was probably *nil*; and that even directly off the coast,

the Nile's influence would probably be found to extend but for a few miles only.

To test this view I commenced an examination of the sea shore and sea bottom at different depths off the whole Egyptian coast; and then compared their result with those obtained from the banks of the Nile at different localities, from the shallows of its bed in the middle of the delta, and also from those found at its apex near Cairo; as places affording true indications of the matter which the river annually transports and deposits in the sea.

* * * * * *

The westerly gales and prevailing north-west breezes are undoubtedly the accumulating and moving causes of this stream of sand dunes which extend from Cape Brulos to Damietta; for as fast as the wind removes the sun-dried sand from the beach, the surf re-accumulates it again during every gale.

This was not only evident, by an examination at two or three intermediate localities, but was confirmed by the natives wherever I landed upon the shore. At times it completely buries the huts of the coast guardsmen; and during strong gales from the westward (the quarter they all describe as that from whence the sand comes) it is not possible to walk against it.

The piercing of the Alps for a railway is comprehensible, as a possible project, because on the day the passage is opened, the main difficulties are overcome. But to endeavour to contend in perpetuity by dredging or by prolongation of piers against the whole littoral movement of the Nile's deposit upon the embouchure of a dead-water harbour, is only the commencement of a perpetual difficulty, connected with the gigantic engineering project of the proposed canalisation of the Isthmus of Suez, with a channel of 27 feet deep. For every gale will obstruct the navigation, and crowd the bay and canal with detained shipping—will renew the obstruction and difficulty of

ingress and egress, by throwing forward continually the sands and moving matter upon the mouth of the harbour, and raising its shallows: and these to an amount of which, in my humble opinion, the dispersal of my eleven bags of clinkers after only twelve days of the month of May weather gives but a very insignificant idea, especially, too, as at the season of north-west and westerly breezes, the Nile is at its high condition, and, therefore, discharging a large quantity of matter into the sea, as its turbid nature along the whole coast at that season fully shows.

In a gigantic engineering project, involving such an enormous outlay for its construction, as well as its annual maintenance, as these facts suggest, it is necessary that the commercial interests invited to speculate in it should thoroughly understand it, so as to form an opinion whether millions of money will not be fruitlessly lost in the deths of the sea, as I must believe will be the case. The experience of the past in the difficulties of engineering against similar hydraulic and physical conditions elsewhere should not be forgotten, and to none are such facts as are here stated of more value and of more real importance than to M. de Lesseps and the International Commission. At least, such is the humble opinion of one, whose only object is to arrive at the truth of nature's laws, and suggest to others the consideration of those truths, before blindly engineering against them; and hence to be certain of the cost and results, before undertaking a work that will have to contend against so vast an amount of physical difficulties in perpetuity.

With this conviction, I leave the question; apologising, at the same time, for intruding upon the arguments connected with the canal part of the project.

But I leave it with this observation, that I find from the different borings made across the Isthmus, to ascertain its nature at the depths required for the proposed canal, and especially across the Lake of Menzaleh and the northern part of the line, that sand greatly predominates in the depths below the level of the surface

water of the Mediterranean; viz., sable blanc, sable, sable de mer, sable vaseux, vase sableuse, &c. (*See* Sections published by M. de Lesseps.) Is not all this sand identical with the quartzose sand of the Nile, although sometimes called sea sand? And will not the infiltration through the sides of a canal, excavated in such loose matter, and at a level so much below the sea and the Nile, more than keep pace with any amount of dredging which it may be possible to apply, consistent with maintaining the navigation open? For this infiltration of sand from the sides of such canals within the delta, by the Commission's own showing, defeats all efforts to contend against it when dug below the Nile's low-water level, as the following extract explains (Section XV., 3d Series): "It appeared to them (the Commission) impossible to maintain in proper repair a canal, the bottom of which was below the line of low water in the Nile, otherwise than by enormous expenditure; and even if incurring this cost, it was uncertain whether the desired result would be obtained. In all cases when an attempt has been to dig a canal below the low-water level, and more especially on the outskirts of the desert in the Ghattal Bay, for instance, it invariably happens that about the level of low water a bed of loose sand is met with, as was the case at Masteroud. This constitutes an enormous difficulty, and a source of expense of which it is hardly possible to form any previous estimate. In the case of the Moëze, all attempts to dredge it have been given up." Here then is an opinion, supported by facts, that really deserves to be kept prominently in mind, in any discussion on the practicability of the canalisation of the Isthmus of Suez. Neither must the great preponderance of sand which the sections of borings across the Isthmus show to be present, be lost sight of, for this sand is there below the low-water level of the Nile and Mediterranean, all of it on the direct line of the proposed canal, and which, I believe, came from the Nile, but was transported there by the sea in ancient days.

(Signed) T. Spratt,
Captain, Her Majesty's Ship "Medina."

Alexandria, 9 July, 1858.

The opinions expressed in Captain Spratt's communications to the British Government on the Suez Canal project, are certainly very unfavourable to that gigantic undertaking. I regret to say the results of all my inquiries in Egypt on this subsubject, and some of them of persons (Frenchmen) who had been actually engaged in the preparatory engineering operations at Suez coincide entirely with Captain Spratt's sentiments as to the utter impracticability of the undertaking.

The grand difficulty of the projected undertaking, in my opinion, is that of maintaining a maritime canal, of about seventy-five miles in length, passing through a desert, from being filled up by sand and weeds.

So far back as 1825, when I first ascended the Nile, *via* the Mahmoudieh Canal, that connects the great river with the Mediterranean, the then newly-made canal was all but impassable for boats deeply laden, from the accumulation of slime and sand at the mouth of the canal, and the enormous quantity of sedges, and weeds of luxuriant growth throughout the entire channel.

In 1854 the canal was rendered almost useless on account of the same impediments. The Viceroy was prevailed on to make a grand effort to get rid of this strong argument against the new project of a canal of far greater length, and more than treble the width, and accordingly, 115,000 men were set to work, and in less than a month the choked canal was cleansed and to some extent cleared with very little loss of life, compared with the enormous expenditure of that very cheap commodity in Egypt, in the making of that canal.

The great work of Mohammed Ali, the Mahmoudieh Canal, was commenced and finished within a year. The number of the poor inhabitants of Upper Egypt carried away from their native villages, of either sex, and of all ages, except those of infancy and senile decrepitude, was 250,000. There was no provision made for them of any kind, except for the first month —a scanty supply of food. The multitude of hard-worked, maltreated, half-famished labourers, perished by thousands, to the extent of 25,000 in the short space of ten months.

The Nile is said by M. Linant, the chief engineer of Mohammed Ali, to pour into the sea by the two mouths—Rosetta and Damietta—in every twenty-four hours 705,514 metres.

The elevation of its waters below the first cataract at Assouan—a distance from the mouths of the river at Rosetta and Damietta—is 543 French feet above the Mediterranean. At the full, it runs at the rate of about three miles an hour, and at the fall at about two miles. The accumulation of deposit from the Nile is estimated by Linant at about four inches in a century in Lower Egypt; a rate of increase that would give about forty feet of soil in the interval from the Deluge to our times.

The inundation of the Nile begins in May, reaches to its height in August, and from that time diminishes.

The canal that communicates between Alexandria and the Nile is 44 miles in length (not 20 leagues as M. de Lesseps very erroneously states), 90 feet in breadth, and from 15 to 18 feet deep. It was opened by Mahommed Ali in 1819. The usual mode of conducting public works in Egypt was practised in the making of the Mahmudie Canal; vast multitudes of the unfortunate peasantry were seized by the military in the several provinces, and embarked on the Nile for the scene of operation, and where, in the progress of the work, twenty thousand perished from want of food, houseing, or care of any kind. Six years after the completion of this work, when I first visited Egypt, in 1825, even then—I repeat the significant fact—the canal was beginning to be choked up at the mouth entering the Nile, and when I again visited Egypt in 1840, the canal was quite impassable, for boats of a large size heavily laden. When I next visited Egypt, the canal had just been rendered navigable for large boats, the bed having been considerably widened; but the railway, opened in 1859, has now rendered the canal of minor importance.

Alexandria is about fourteen miles W.S.W. of the Canopic mouth of the Nile.

Alexandria is the only port in the north-western coast of

Egypt in which there is deep water and security for shipping throughout the year. The misnamed ports of Rosetta and Damietta are, in fact, only roadsteads, and even these are difficult of access, each having a bar on which there is always a dangerous surf. Rosetta is on the western branch, and Damietta on the eastern branch of the Nile. Under the Ptolemies, Alexandria was at the height of its greatness. It was then the first commercial city in the world, and continued so to be under the Romans. Its conquest by the Saracens in 640, A.D., was the first great blow to its prosperity and magnificence; the Regime of the Mamelukes and Turks was the next; the discovery of the route to India by the Cape of Good Hope, in 1498, was the coup de grace to the Great Emporium of the Eastern world.*

In considering the Suez Canal project, the commerce and agricultural produce have to be taken into account.

The computed value of the products of Egypt imported from that country into Great Britain and Ireland in 1857, Mc'Culloch estimates at (in sterling) £7,853,876, and the declared value of British and Irish produce exported to Egypt the same year, £1,899,289. With respect to the cotton imported from Egypt into Great Britain and Ireland in 1857, Mc'Culloch returns the quantity at 219,038 cwts., and the value thereof £971,744. The weight of a bale of Egyptian cotton at Alexandria averages 230 rottoli, or 228 lbs. English, and a fraction. Allowing 12 rottoli as tare for sacking and cordage, the nett weight of the bale will be 219 lbs. The cantar of cotton is 100 rottoli. Mc'Culloch, speaking of the great increase in the growth and exportation of Egyptian cotton, says:—"We doubt, however, whether the encouragement given to the culture of cotton has not been really injurious to Egypt."

* Under the Ptolemies the population of Alexandria is believed to have been 300,000. When I first visited it, in 1825, it was not much above 20,000.

In 1860, when I last visited Egypt, the population was supposed to average about 80,000, but it varies considerably at different seasons, and according to Mc'Culloch (see new edition of "Commercial Dictionary," published in 1859; p. 15), when greatest it is supposed to exceed 100,000.

Mc'Culloch says that cotton has been grown in Egypt from a remote period, but of a very inferior quality, short stapled, and closely resembling "surats." But in 1820 Monsieur Jumel accidentally found a valuable variety of long stapled cotton, grown in the garden of Mahe Bey, at Cairo, raised from seeds growing in Dougala and Senaar. On Jumel reporting of the superiority of this cotton to the Pacha Mohammed Ali, the cultivation of it was immediately undertaken in a large scale, and for a long time this Mahe, or Makko, cotton has been the principal export from Egypt. The quantity of cotton exported in 1858, according to Mc'Culloch, was 579,537 cantars. The value, in Egyptian piastres, 109,102,700.

The total value of Egyptian products exported he estimates at 301,844,582 piastres.*

The Red Sea is a long narrow channel beset with coral reefs, with regular alternating succession of monsoon winds prevailing, especially at the entrance of the straits of Bab-el-Mandel calculated at particular periods, and for lengthened ones too, to obstruct navigation and prolong voyages, that, with favorable winds might be made in seven or eight days, to periods of thirty-six days and upwards in the case of sailing vessels. The extreme length of this sea is 560 leagues (upwards of 1,500 miles), and the average breadth from 25 to 30 leagues, the greatest width not exceeding 150 miles. But the Red Sea, long before the application of steam to navigation was certainly used extensively by sailing vessels of different nations, for in 1774 we find that the East India Company solicited the Turkish government that the Red Sea should be closed against all European vessels excepting their own, *and that moderate* request was granted by the Porte.

Ergo—M. St. Hilaire, in his essay on the Maritime Canal project, concludes that the Red Sea was then deemed sufficiently navigable for European sailing vessels. But in 1779 a pious Sultan, lamenting the concession of the Red Sea to the Giaours

* The exchange with England is generally about 100 piastres to £1 sterling.

of any nation, issued a Hatti-Sheriffe in revocation of the above mentioned concession, declaratory of his intention of reserving the Red Sea for the Holy Pilgrimage to Mecca, and prohibiting it to all European vessels, including those of England.*

M. de Lesseps, having written to a superior officer of the French navy, who had just been engaged in exploring the Red Sea, for his opinion on the difficulties of navigating that expanse of water, has received an answer from which we select the following passages :—

"About fifteen years ago, if I am not mistaken, the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company, having secured a harbour of refuge, and established a coal depôt at Aden, began its service between Suez and the East Indies. From one departure per month, the Company has gradually arrived at a weekly departure. Eight times a month, forty-eight times a year, large screw or paddle-wheel steamers, with a draught of water varying from 18 to 21 feet, as much as our largest frigates, run up and down the Red Sea regardless of weather and trade-winds, and yet during the whole time only one vessel, the *Alma*, has been lost, and the causes of that disaster are still but very imperfectly known. If these results are highly honourable to the captains employed by the Company, it must also be admitted that they are not very unfavourable to the character of the Red Sea. Are we to say then, that no dangers exist in the Red Sea? Certainly not. Throughout its whole length, and on both shores, there are many rocks both above and below the surface, which call for the most vigilant watchfulness on the part of all who navigate it, and cause captains many a sleepless night and wearisome watches to the crews ; but are not such the inevitable duties of a seafaring life? . . . . . The Red Sea is little affected by the tides. The currents obey the prevailing winds, which blow almost regularly and in zones, generally from the north between Suez and Djeddah, are variable in the middle region, and are mostly from the south in

* Reply of M. B. St. Hilaire, member of the Institution of France, to the Edinburgh Review. Lon. 1856.

the neighbourhood of the straits of Bab-el-Mandel. Sailing vessels will have carefully to note the seasons which modify either way these general but not absolute directions of the wind in order to avoid the long detentions; but contrary winds can hardly be called dangers."

The situation of Suez, in a commercial point of view, is excellent, lying nearly at the extremity of the Arabian Gulph; it is only three days' journey from Cairo, five and a half from Damietta, eight from Hebron, the modern *Kalyb*, ten days from Jerusalem, two days and a half from the *Haman Pharoon*, and five from Sinai.

On the occasion of a visit of mine to Suez, of which an account has been published, one of my first objects was to ascertain if the sea was fordable, opposite the town, at eb-tide; the Consular agent and the Levantine writers of the Governor assured me that it was not, but I attached little importance to their assertions. I therefore desired my servant to find me an Indian sailor, who wished to earn a dollar, by crossing the gulf. In the evening, a man made his appearance, who offered to make the attempt. I explained to him the nature of the object I wanted to ascertain. I directed him to walk straight across, as far as it was possible to do so, and to hold his hands over his head as he walked along. He was in the water forthwith; he proceeded slowly and steadily, his hands above his head; and in nine minutes he was at the other side of the Red Sea. On his return, he told me what I knew to be a fact, that he had walked every step across, the deepest part being about the middle of the gulf, when the water was up to his chin. I proceeded now to follow his course; I gave him another dollar to cross over before me, and as I was nearly eight inches taller than my guide, where his chin was in the water, my long beard was quite dry.

The tide was now coming in fast, and by the time we reached the middle of the sea, the Indian thought it imprudent to proceed further, as I could not boast of being an expert swimmer. Had we remained ten minutes longer, we should inevitably

have suffered Pharoah's fate, for the opposite bank was perceptibly diminishing, and at ten o'clock, the sea, which was hardly more than the breadth of the Thames at London Bridge, two hours before, was now from two to three miles broad. I returned perfectly convinced that the Red Sea, opposite Suez, is passable at ebb-tide.

By a mark which I made on a perpendicular rock on the seaside, about eighty paces from the spot we forded, I found the difference between the ebb and flow, to be six feet two inches. The fountains of *Moses*, above *El Naba*, are about seven miles from Suez, by water, but by land the distance is double.

Five miles to the north of Suez, the sea terminates in a narrow creek and saline marsh, which it is necessary to wind round in going by land to *El Naba*. Niebuhr says he walked across this creek at ebb-tide, and was only knee deep in water. The Bedouins do this daily, but I am not aware that any European before me ever attempted the passage of the sea opposite Suez: indeed, the very inhabitants considered it impracticable, till I proved the contrary.*

The *Times* correspondent writes from Alexandria, Nov. 20th, 1860:—

"When M. de Lesseps first started his scheme for uniting the waters of the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, the subject was received and discussed with intense interest by the European public in Egypt. The thing had been presented in a form to strike the imagination; curiosity was felt in respect to the political views that might be taken of it by different nations, and, in addition to these, another cause operated in the matter. The Russian war had just then opened out an era of great prosperity to the country. All descriptions of produce, goods and property were daily rising in value, every one was growing rich and with the influx of money there was springing up a spirit of speculation, than which none could be better calculated to

* Madden's Travels in the East, vol. 2, p. 208.

insure an eager welcome to this, or, indeed to any scheme that might have presented itself. An immense number of shares were accordingly immediately taken up; but alas! before long a total change had come over the formerly flourishing state of affairs, and when M. de Lesseps made his first demand for something more substantial than sympathising speeches and fine words, his Egyptian friends, one and all, closely buttoned up their pockets, and what is more, accompanied their refusal with some very hard remarks about their being called upon to pay down their money, when, as they asserted, the most essential conditions under which it had been subscribed were altogether unfulfilled. M. de Lesseps unfortunately lost his temper, and roundly charged the Alexandrians with being a set of unworthy gambling speculators, with whom sordid motives of gain outweighed all the higher and nobler aspirations with which his shareholders ought to be actuated. This of course did not mend matters, and down to the present day, I believe no shares whatever are held in Egypt, always excepting, of course, that unfortunate moiety of the capital which ill-luck or whatever it may be, has fastened on the broad shoulders of the Government or the Viceroy. I have been led into this retrospect by the singular contrast afforded between the intense eagerness with which the subject and everything connected with it was at one time discussed, and the cold indifference with which it is now treated. In fact it is this state of general unconcern which I must plead as the chief excuse for my inability to give you any precise information as to how things are progressing at the so-called Port Said, or at the more inland stations of the Suez desert. These places are so much out of the ordinary tracks of communication that, in as far as regards the obtaining of information from independent witnesses, they might as well be in the interior of Tartary, or on the shores of the Victoria Nyanza. It is true a few French officials of the company, superintendents, and others, come and go at frequent intervals, but these people have got into the way of looking upon it as a matter of course that everything pro-

ceeding from these sources must be taken *cum grano salis*; and in point of fact, such a spoonful of the condiment is added, that its saline flavour overpowers all else, and the only result produced is a general impression that a more or less free expenditure of money is going on, with very little real or tangible effect. I can, however, speak with more precision of the operations carried on at the quarries of Meks, which lie close in the neighbourhood of Alexandria, and whence, we are informed, the stone is to be procured for building the immense jetties and harbour of Port Said. The road from the town leads to the westward, along the sea shore, towards the Fort of the Marabout. The coast and approaches to Alexandria are here strongly defended by lines of batteries and detached forts, most of which, I believe, are now unarmed: and lastly, with a deep ditch and earthworks running at a right angle from the sea towards Lake Mareotis. Immediately beyond this is a quarry given by the Viceroy to the Suez Canal Company. A stone jetty, with tramways, has been run out a short way into the sea, and a little further west another has been commenced. The two, I am informed, are at their extremities to be deflected towards each other, so as to form an enclosed harbour, within which it will be possible to load the stone-barges in all weathers. A piece of rising ground, sloping gently upwards towards the rear, marks the site of the quarry. It has been opened up in two places, in each of which a steam crane at intervals lazily lifts a block of stone into a truck. Scattered about, in the quays on the piers, when I visited the place a couple of days ago, there were some twenty Arab labourers intermixed with some half dozen Europeans, by whom the work seems to be carried on in a slow and easy sort of way, very different from the active and bustling mode of working I had been led to expect.

In Dec., 1860, the Viceroy of Egypt made a journey to Suez, where he remained some days examining *the preparations for* the intended works connected with the great undertaking of the Suez Canal.

The *Times* correspondent, in a letter from Alexandria, dated December 17th, says:—

"Since Said Pasha's return from Suez, intelligence has been received of certain disturbances having lately arisen with the Bedouins of the neighbouring deserts. It was at first stated that they had interfered with the work people engaged in laying the foundations of the Red Sea lighthouses; but, according to later and more reliable reports, the affray has solely been between a small number of Bedouins, recruited as labourers by M. de Lesseps for his canal works, and a small detachment of Egyptian irregular troops. The Egptian Government, it appears, objects to the introduction of Bedouin Arabs into the Isthmus, and in the endeavour to prevent the enrolment, by the opposition of its influence among the Bedouins, a quarrel has taken place in which one or two men have lost their lives. It is difficult to understand what the precise objections of the Egyptian Government to the enrolment of the Bedouins may be; but even to those least favourable to the prosecution of M. de Lessep's scheme, it will be a matter of regret that, if good and solid grounds exist for the prohibition, they should not be set forth in an open and unassailable manner. M. de Lesseps went to Suez for the declared purpose of engaging labourers for the canal works, and of imparting a fresh impulse to the progress of the company's operations. As might easily be foreseen, his efforts in that direction met with but very slender success. Whether with or without the approval of the Government, he has little chance of collecting more than a trifling number of Bedouins, and still less of being able to keep them at work for any length of time. Even their love of money will never be sufficient to overcome their innate dislike for labour of any kind, and they will moreover encounter the same causes for discontent as those that have acted in the case of the Egyptian fellahs.

"These people are industrious and laborious to the highest degree, in spite of which the attempts to secure their services have proved altogether ineffectual, as was, indeed, clearly foretold by

all possessing the slightest knowledge of their temper and character. The small number allured by the prospect of high pay soon grow dissatisfied, and endeavour, by every means in their power to obtain their discharge. Attempts have been made to maintain discipline by flogging, a thing which will lead to serious consequences if attempted with Bedouins. In the case of the fellahs, the immediate result has been that the men desert in bodies, sacrificing the arrears of pay that are held back in the endeavour to bind them to their work. Not only, however, is this the case with the native labourers, but even the European artisans have been throwing up their appointments in large numbers. One, a Frenchman, when lately asked why he had abandoned his place, answered that at first he got men but no pickaxes, then he was supplied with pickaxes but no men, and at last, when he had both labourers and tools, they found themselves without stores or provision of any kind, upon which he and his men appear to have left the place in a body. The only work that can, though by a stretch of language, be characterised as in the least degree effective, is performed by the dredging machines, a small number of which are at work in Lake Menzaleh, and one at an inner station, whither it has been conveyed with heavy expense of labour and time. These machines, it had been announced, would excavate 1,800 cubic metres per day, instead of which the *maximum* of their work proves to be only 200 cubic metres each. At Port Said, the tramway constructed for the purpose of conveying materials to the jetty, and which last spring was destroyed by the sea, has not been repaired. Some of the inland stations have been altogether abandoned. At one the few men that remain are employed in collecting natives, for what useful purpose in connection with the canal it is hard to understand. At another the men have been engaged in cutting a section of the grand canal on its full scale, the object of which seems equally, if not more mysterious, since even the elementary cutting cannot be said to have been anywhere fairly commenced. M. de Lesseps late applied to the Viceroy for assistance in ob-

taining work-people—in other words, to be supplied with forced labour—a request which Said Pacha has refused the French Government. The latter for the present appear inclined to leave M. de Lesseps to his own resources. If this policy of "non-intervention" be persisted in, the affairs of the Canal Company will probably soon come to an issue, and, for the sake of the shareholders, it may be added, the sooner the better."

The *Times*, of the 27th of December, 1860, thus ridicules the project of "the Suez Canal." Will our friends on the other side of the Strait forgive us if we remind them of a subject on which we were talking with considerable vehemence some few months ago? Pray, how is the Isthmus of the Suez Canal getting on? We are impatient for the performance of those magnificent promises. We are waiting anxiously to sail through that bit of desert which cuts us off from the East and sends us down across the equator and round the Stormy Cape. We heard, not long ago, that it was the destiny of France to confer this great benefit upon the world; and we heard her insist that she would force it down the throat of perfidious Albion, reluctant even as perfidious Albion might be to receive it, and anxious as perfidious Albion might be to prevent others from rejoicing in it. The fruits of this great achievement to be achieved were to be enjoyed by us and others in our own despite, and we were to confess by about this time the superior civilization and enterprise of France. Now, we hope our excellent ally has not been defrauding the world of a great deal of very sparkling admiration, to say nothing of the mere dross which lay at the bottom. We hope she has not been discounting the performance of this engineering miracle, and fancying that the work has been completed, and that there is no further need of any exertion. We want to sail through the Isthmus of Suez. M. de Lesseps and the whole French press have promised us, not always in the most flattering language, that we should do so. We put aside the wording of the promise and regard only its purport; and here we are with good, sound ships, well laden, ready to pass through, and to pay any reasonable toll for

liberty to do so. It will not do to say, "You never gave us any money." That was no condition to the promise. We are ready to pay you toll. We never intended to sink money in that particular quicksand, and we always protested that we never would spend money on such a scheme. But, although we will not advance sixpence, we are quite ready to enjoy all the benefits of success. Solomon was the wisest of men, and when Solomon sent his ships that had been built on the shore of the Red Sea to Ophir (or Africa) for gold and ivory, he very probably sent them through the old Suez Canal; but we never heard that Solomon had anything to do with the making of that Canal. If he had, in all probability his name would not have come down to us as that of the wisest of men, and he would not have died so rich as he did. We emulate Solomon. We propose to use this canal, and not to make it. Of course, we are a mere nation of shopkeepers, and we take the sordid point of view; but M. de Lesseps is of Imperial connexion, and leads a generous people to the van of civilization. France and M. de Lesseps will never go back from their united word, and baulk us of the boon they promised us, or meanly tell us that they had meant that we should buy it. We feel that we have as much right to enquire from time to time how our Suez Ship Canal is going on, as well as a borough alderman, or a churchwarden, or a tax collector to whom a service of plate has been voted by an admiring circle, has to go into Hunt and Roskell's from time to time, and see how his cream-jug and tea-pot go on. France has voted to us, and subscribed for us, and promised us a canal for our ships. Scarcely anyone, besides us, has any ships trading to India and the East, and we are naturally anxious to know how our *cadeau* progresses. The news we publish from Egypt is very disheartening. According to our correspondent's account, there is as little doing in the way of resuming the work of Pharoah Necho, as though M. de Lesseps had never been born, and Suez canal shares had never been taken upon the Bourse at Paris, or proffered upon the Stock Exchange in London. Ever and anon,

it seems, important-looking official personages go forth into the Desert, perhaps to bear away the most pressing sins of the directors; but it is not yet apparent that all the expenditure has hitherto effected even the easy process of making a channel through the sand. It is not certain that M. de Lesseps, with all his millions, has up to this time cleared as much sand away as Mr. Davis with a few Arabs and a few hundreds of pounds, and a few months' time, cleared away from the mounds of Carthage. Now, the difficulty of this Suez Canal is like the difficulty of rearing a poor man's child—it lies chiefly in the mouth. There is no difficulty in making the canal; the difficulty is in filling it and keeping it filled. Scarcely any preparation has been made towards providing for the mouth. They have run out two little jetties into the sea near the spot where the stone lies, which is to be used to make a stone basin for that part of the Mediterranean into which the too generous Nile is ever pouring its embarrassing superfluity of soil banks. But this preparation has, as we understand, nothing to do with the canal, but is only to form a harbour for the transports which are to convey the stone which is to be an item in the construction of the canal; it has about the same relation to the completion of the canal which the arrival of Joseph in Egypt had to the completion of the Pyramids."

But whatever may be the result of the undertaking to connect the Red Sea with the Mediterranean, it is impossible to overlook, and it would be unworthy of an enlightened man of any nation to depreciate the magnitude of the enterprize, and the vastness of the service it would render to mankind were it accomplished. It would do more for the different nations and peoples of the East than ever we accomplished for them by our International Commission in Syria, or our battles of diplomacy in Constantinople, or campaigns in the Crimea, in fruitless efforts to sustain and preserve the tottering power of the Turkish Empire. And, be it remembered, the man who originated and attempted to accomplish this gigantic work, has laboured at it with signal courage and perseverance, and abilities of no common

order, for seven years, and that amidst enormous difficulties, discouragement, and impediments thrown in his way at the Porte, as well as at the Court of the Viceroy of Egypt, he is still labouring for the attainment of his mighty object, and contending manfully with adverse influences on all sides. I am quite sure his efforts will be unavailing, not because the engineering difficulties connected with the undertaking, great as they are, must be considered insuperable, but because the financial difficulties connected with it are so, the projector being a Frenchman, and action being brought to bear on his transactions in the principal European money markets, that may have its origin in political jealousies and misgivings—perhaps groundless misapprehensions—and in adverse railway competition on the part of projectors of Egyptian and Turkish railway lines.

M. de Lesseps' vast project, and the result I fear for it, are destined, in all probability, to illustrate an aphorism of our great moralist and magniloquent sentence-maker:—"Great enterprizes are always laudable even when they are beyond the strength that undertakes them." But there would be no harm in qualifying a little this piece of proverbial wisdom by adding —when the means that are expended on it are the projector's own, or the probability of success is so great as to warrant speculation attended with some risk to others.

END OF APPENDIX.

INDEX.

Abdallah Maimun, first founder of secret societies in the heart of Islamism, 2, 178.

Abdul Medjid, Sultan, succeeds his father Mahmoud II., the 2nd July, 1839; notice of his career; amiable character, and natural disposition; feeble temperament; early exhaustion of his vital and mental energies attributed by Dr. Openheim to drugs administered to him with a view to rendering him imbecile, 1, 439, 449; remarkable proceeding in relation to a fresco picture of the Virgin and an altar; a portrait of a Greek Emperor discovered in the mosque of San Sophia, 1, 449; Abdul Medjid's charter of Reform; the Hatti Sheriffe of Gulhaneh proclaimed in 1840, and its embodiment in the Tanzimat, 1, 450, 458; his death; notice of his career, 2, 387.

Abdul Azis, present Sultan; singular instance of his fanaticism, 2, 273; his accession to the throne, notice of his fanaticism and encouragement of the promoters of the Syrian massacres, 2, 393; the present Sultan, previously to the death of his predecessor, the head of the fanatic party of Constantinople; alleged complicity with the recent massacres in Syria, 2, 271.

Abou Beker, first caliph after Mahommed, his wars and slaughters of Christians in Syria; capture of Damascus; his death, 632, A.D., 1, 128, 133.

Advocates of Turkish institutions, 1, 2.

Adversaries of Christian principles, 1, 2.

"Advanced thinkers" in England tolerant of Turkish antagonism to Christians, 1, 4.

Alexandria taken by Amron, lieutenant of Caliph Omar; destruction of famous library, 1, 138, 145.

Alexandria, Emperor of Russia, "a Greek of the lower empire," his axiom "Russia must have the key of her own house," Constantinople being deemed the key to Russia, 2, 257.

Ali, son-in-law and cousin of Mohammed Fourth Cailiph; cabals and contests at his election; war against him waged by Ayesha; Moawiyah sends an army against him from Syria; assassinations of the Calliph Ali, A.D. 661, 1, 155, 177; elections of the remarkable sentences of Ali, 1, 184, 187; tomb and place of pilgrimage, described by Loftus, 1, 471.

Ali Bey, conqueror of Mecca, his raids in Syria 2, 243.

Alison, Sir A., opinion of the evils of Turkish rule, 2, 406.

Amurath I., third Ottoman Sultan, notice of his career, 1, 256; entered on the mission of the Ottoman sovereigns at the beginning of his reign by warfare with the Christians; crossed the Hellespont with a numerous army intended for the capture of Constantinople, and fixed his head-quarters in Galipoli in 1360, A.D., 1, 257; massacre of young Greek nobles on the banks of the river Marizza, 1, 263; decisive victory over the Confederate Christian Sclavonic Powers in 1389, 1, 265; put his son Saoud to death, 1, 268; assassination of the Sultan by the hand of a Servian nobleman, 1, 267.

Ansayrii, of Syria, religion and peculiarities; Walpole's account of; account of in an Arab geography lately printed at Beyrout by the American missionaries; Rev. Mr. Lyde's account of their religion, 2, 195, 208.

Andronicus, son of the Greek Emperor Paleologus; his terrible fate, 1, 263.

Arabs of Syria, different tribes and races, 2, 12, 13.

Armenia, Ancient, notice of its people and religion; its language; the alphabet of, invented by Stalescop, A.D., 406, 1, 212, 215.

Armenians, persecutions of for embracing Protestantism, 2, 38, 39; origin, language; introduction of Christianity 260 A.D.; like the Jews they preserve a distinct national and religious existence; cession of a large portion of their territory to Russia in 1827; numbers in Ottoman Empire, 2, 117, 121; community of, in the Turkish Empire, notice of, 2, 117, 132; their church; origin of its schism and separation from Church of Rome in 6th century; chief points at variance; persecutions; violent controversies relative to election of Primate in 1845, 2, 133, 152; notice of those

in communion with the Church of Rome in the Turkish empire, 2, 133, 152.
Assassins, secret order of; their early history and organization in the time of the caliphs, 1, 194, 204; derivation from them of the existing secret sects of Syria; J. Von Hammer's history of, 2, 162, 194; origin and organization of their order; their hostility to the caliphs; their reply to the envoy of Sultan Sandiar as to their doctrine; their destruction by Hulaku the lieutenant of Mangu Khan; secret sects supposed to be derived from, 2, 176, 195.
Athos Mount; account of the monasteries in its district, 2, 81, 84.
Attila, "the scourge of God;" his career of conquest, rapacity, destruction in the Roman Provinces in Asia Minor, and from the Black Sea to the Gulf of Venice, in France and Italy; stayed in the vicinity of Rome by the great St. Leo in its course of blood and fire; end of his career, 1, 225, 226.
Author, statement of subjects treated in both volumes of work, 1, 22; his experience of the utter failure of Protestant missionaries to convert the Moslems, 2, 31; his practical experience of the mode of supplying Armenian Church with clergy, 2, 126; at Jerusalem when news of battle of Navarino arrived; departure from and arrival in Egypt, 2, 144; his first visit to the East in 1824 and object of it, 2, 263; experience of dire results of Turkish rule in Asia Minor, 2, 403.
Austria, base conduct of, in the case of the Greek patriot Rhigas, a refugee in the Austrian dominions delivered up to the Turkish Government and put to death; uniform baseness of Austrian policy in the East, 2, 261, 262.
Ayesha, the prophets, favourite wife, account of, 1, 54.
Ayesha, widow of the prophet; her occupation; causing rebellion, mutinies, and massacres, and intrigues against Ali, son-in-law of Mohammed, 1, 151, 156, 158.

Bajazet Sultan, notice of his career, 1, 268; fratricidal imperial policy; murder of his brother Yacoub; justification on Koran principles, by "Turkish History," 1, 269; first Ottoman ruler took the title of Sultan, ib.; his brutal character, 1, 270; at the pinnacle of Ottoman greatness in 1402, A.D., when Timour, the Tartar, invaded his dominions, after having overrun a great portion of the globe; defeated the Turkish Sultan and took the latter prisoner; question of his imprisonment in an iron cage; death of Bajazet, 1, 284, 287.
Beyrout, account of, 2, 5.
Blanqui, Mons., his view of the Turkish charter of toleration; the Hatti Sheriffe of Gul-Haneh—"an atrocious deception," 2, 281.
Borè, de Mons., results of protestant and catholic missions, in the East, compared, 2, 41.
Bulgarians, alleged movement of thousands of their race, their separation from the Orthodox Greek Church, and junction with the Latin Church, 2, 22.
Bulwer, Sir H., his detailed statement of Turkish finances, 2, 401.
Buddhism, numbers of followers throughout the world, 2 appendix.

Caliphate, notice of; an account of religion of the Saracens, previous to and after Mohammed, 1, 116, 194.
Candia, evil results there of Turkish rule, 2, 404.
Canning, Sir Stratford, remonstrance with Sultan against execution of Ovaghian, a young Armenian, for the exercise of religious right; succeeds in obtaining abrogation of the law Ovaghian executed; and consequent European intervention in affairs of the Turkish Empire, 2, 131, 132.
Causcasus, one of its remarkable tribes—the Ossites, 1, 216.
Chaldeans, number in union with Church of Rome; their origin, language, &c., 2, 26, 27.
Chasseaud, his observations on the Egyptian occupation of Syria, and the part taken by the Druses in relation to it; his remarkable account of religion of Druses, 2, 226.
Church and State connexions, evils of 2, 86.
Churchill, Colonel, letter on futile measures of international commission in relation to Syrian massacres, 2, 361.
Clement, his election as metropolitian of the Russian Church, 1197; the cause of a religious war which lasted a century, 2, 58.
Constantinople, capture of, by Sultan Mohammed 2nd, in 1453, A.D.; doom of the Christian Rayahs of the Turkish Empire, and consequences of the overthrow of Greek Empire, 1, 290; formulas of capitulations, those of people of Jerusalem to the Caliph Omaz, and of inhabitants of people of Constantinople to Sultan Mohammed the 2nd, 1, 290, 298; capture of; population of, at time of capture; estimates of the slain; one of the Turkish conqueror's first acts after the capture of the city; riding into the church of St. Sophia; his next visit to the palace of the slain Emperor Constantine the 9th; his sentimental repetition of the lines of Ferdousi; in that palace issues his infamous orders to seize on a child of the Grand Duke Nicholas Notaras, and subsequent orders to put Notaras and his whole family to death, 1, 289, 299; different Christian sects of, 2, 19, 20.
Consuls in Syria, the legitimate duties of; subordinated to polemical obligations to missionary institutions, 2, 268; proposal of the author of a recent French treatise on Syrian affairs, to dismember Turkey and make Constantinople the seat of the pontifical government, 2, 415.
Consuls in Syria, proceedings of, in 1860, 2, 349.
Creasy, Professor, his history of Turkish Empire, 1, 10.
Crusade, new, in 1396; its lamentable results, and massacre by Sultan Bajazet of the principal Christian leaders, 1, 271.
Crusade, fatal battle for the Christians at Nicopolis, in 1396, A.D., 1, 273.
Crusades, Gibbon's sentiments in relation to, 1, 258; question of legitimacy, justice, and necessity of war, ib.; crusade instituted against the Turks on behalf of the Christians of Hungary, and its results, in 1376, ib. Dates of different crusades, 2, appendix.
Cyprus, dire results of Turkish rule there, 2, 404.

Daher, Sheik, governor of St. Jean d'Acre, his career and its termination, 2, 242, 247.
Damascus; execution of Achmed Pacha, Osman Bey, Ali Bey, and Mustapha Bey, 2, 342; evidence of the horrors of the massacre at

Damascus and Deir-el-Kammar, ten weeks after their occurrence described by a correspondent of a London journal, 2, 344.
Dervishes; ministers and agents of Turkish fanaticism; the part taken by them at the commencement of the massacres in the Lebanon, 2, 273; notice of origin and vicissitudes of their order; their mysticism and fanaticism; their intimate connexion with the Janissaries; their agency in the Turkish provinces in all conspiracies against Christian Rayahs, concocted in Constantinople, 1, 319, 334.
Diabekr, dire results of Turkish rule there, 2, 405.
Djezzar, Pacha, notice of, 2, 245.
Druses; alleged derivation of origin from Assassins of Syria of olden time; doctrines, observances, and prejudices same as the Ansayrii, 2, 162; looked upon as the representatives in Syria of the Ismalian sect of the followers of Ali, from whom the Assassins are derived, 2, 196; notice of their history; origin attributed to the Saracens who settled in Syria during a term of 300 years, and their religion said to be derived from the Karmatians, one of the earliest sects of Mohammedanism; massacre of Druses by Ansayrii, in 1811, 2, 210, 212; historical notice of the government of the Druses; anecdotes of those who held the reins of government from 1651 to 1845, 2, 213; Chasseaud's observations on the part taken by them on the Egyptian occupation of Syria, 2, 220; Lord Lindsay's account of, in "Letters on Egypt, Edom, and the Holy Land," in 1836, 2, 224, 234; their towns and villages, 2, 225, 226; their religious rites and practices, detailed from an original Druse document, 2, 226, 233; what is to be done with the Druses? what has been done with them to secure the Christians from their fanaticism, 2, 233; their perfidious conduct in the wars of Sheik Daher and Djezzar Pacha, 2, 246; massacres of Christians in 1860, detailed account of, 2, 281, 368; detailed account of their frightful murders and savagery on the Maronites in 1860, 2, 305, 368; "gentleman," a graphic sketch of, in "The Times," 2, 336; general views of their atrocities against the Syrian Christians in 1860, 2, 351.

Easthope, Lady, a strenuous defender and eulogist of Turkish institutions, 1, 10.
Egypt, brief notice of its early history and vicissitudes, 1, 308; English expedition against, in 1807, 1, 364; first visit of the author to Egypt, in 1824, second in 1840, and third in 1860, striking changes in population of Alexandria, and produce of the soil in those intervals, 1, 391; notice of career of Mohammed Ali; his wars with the Mamelukes, and ultimate massacre of their chiefs, 1, 403, 411; in 1814 Mohammed Ali issued a decree declaring himself sole possessor of all the soil of Egypt; his war in Syria; statistics of Egypt; finances, population, &c., 1, 411, 420.
England, support given to the Greek cause honourable to her character, that support being unselfishly unsectarian as well as unprecedented, 2, 265.
English policy in regard to Turkey; Pitt's idea of the balance of power, and the necessity of opposing Russian views in Turkey, and maintaining that empire; expedition to Egypt, 1; 355, 364.
Ertogrul, father of Othman, first sovereign of the Turkish empire, notice of, 1, 243.
Eton's opinion of the rapacious and aggressive government of Turkey, 1, 15.
Eutychians, the Doctrine of, 2, 253.

Fanaticism, the permanent dark shadow of it over the Turkish empire, described by Dr, Newman, 1, 473.
Fanaticism, its existence at the present time throughout the Turkish empire; the present Sultan its active protector and defender previous to his accession to the throne, 2, 267, 270.
Finances, Turkish, latest and most reliable statement of, by Sir Henry Bulwer, 2, 401. latest official statement of, communicated to Lord Russell, Aug, 1860, 2, 491.
Fratricidal policy of, the Turkish Sultans at various periods, 1, 371, 422.

Gibbon, his account of the capture of Constantinople; his antipathy to Christianity; want of sympathy for the sufferings of the Greek Christians at the hands of Turks, 1, 291.
Graham, Mr., his report to Lord Dufferin on the Syrian massacres, to 18th July, 1860, 2, 313,
Greece; insurrection in Epirus in 1853, after signal successes against the Turks, denounced by the allied French and English governments, and indirect measures taken for its suppression, 1, 511; her various attempts at revolution; her ultimate success in 1821, 2, 260.
Greeks, number in European Turkey, Syria, and Asia Minor, 2, 64, 66; secular clergy of the orthodox church notice of, 2, 71, 80; monks and monasteries of the Greek Church, 2, 80, 86.
Greek Church, divided into three distinct communions; schism between it and Latin Church; organization of, at downfall of Constantinople, and of Greek Empire, 2, 51, 52, 54, 55; its separation from Latin Church; number of persons belonging to it, 2, 63, 64; clergy of; revenues of patriarch and bishops; constant recurrence of genuflexions in its religious ceremonies, especially in monasteries; frequency and rigour of fasts; its constitution, 2, 67, 71, 77.
Greek Orthodox Church, its history and constitution, both in Russia and Turkey, 2, 51, 62.
Greek and Latin Churches, separation of, 2, 63, 65; strength and status of the Greek community in European Turkey, 2, 66, 70; proposed re-union; efforts of the present Pontiff for that object, and their results, 2, 87, 116; proposed re-union; reply of Orthodox Eastern Church to encyclical letter of Pius IX., in 1848; a document which may be considered an exposition of the Greek Orthodox doctrine, 2, 91, 115.
Guilleminot, Count, French ambassador at the Porte; protects the members of the Roman Catholic Church in Ottoman dominions, 1829, 2, 144.
Gurowski, Count, his work on Russia and its policy in the East, 2, 411.

Hakem, the third of the Fatimite caliphs, assumes a divine character; his persecutions; his reign a wild mixture of vice and folly, 2, 170.
Hammer, Von, observations on Turkish his-

tory, 1, 10; hyperbolical eulogies of the Koran, 1, 59; his history of the Assassins, the only detailed authentic account, 2, 166.
Hassan, son of Ali, fifth caliph after Mohammed resigned the caliphate to Moawiyah after having reigned about six months, retired to Medina, and died of poison administered by one of his wives, 661, A.D., 1, 188, 192.
Hassan Sabah, founder of a new branch of the sect of Seveners, his extraordinary career, 2, 172, 179; fate of his relatives, 2, 180.
Hassoun, Monsignore, appointed by the Vatican to be primate of Constantinople, 1845; displeasure of the national church at his appointment, 2, 148.
Héraclius, the Greek Emperor, his wars with Persia; his introduction into his dominions of Turcoman tribes as auxiliaries, 1, 209.
Holy places in Syria; cause of the Crimean war; various controversies preceding it, and claims of different powers to a protectorate over Christians of several denominations, 1, 482, 498.

Ibrahim Pacha, invasion of Syria in 1831; opinion of Europe, 2, 44, 45, 46; his unsuccessful attempts to subdue the Druses during three campaigns, 2, 220; remarkable incident evincing his cruel despotism, 2, 221.
Imposture in religion, and impostors who become fanatics considered in relation to the Koran, and its author, 1, 72.
Imperial pride, its hostilities to truth in eminently prosperous nations, 1, 71.
Introductory chapter of Turkish institutions, 1, 1.
Ionian Islands, origin of the English protectorate, 1, 395, 360 measures taken by the English government against the insurgents of Epirus in arms against the Turks, in 1853, 1, 512.
Islamism, different sects which sprung from, 2, 166, 169.

Janissary institution, its brutal characteristics in the time of the Sultan Bajazet, 1, 270.
Janissaries, the, notice of origin, progress, and end in 1826, 1, 334, 352; their excesses in Servia in 1807, 1, 361; notice of their career, 1, 356, 358, 426; their massacre in June, 1826, 1, 428.
Jeremiah II., Patriarch of Constantinople, declines proposal of Czar Theodore to set up his patriarchal throne in city of Vladimir, and thereby establish a Russian patriarchate independent altogether of Greek patriarchate, 2, 59.
Jesuits, missionary establishments in Turkish Empire, 2, 21.
Jerusalem, terms of capitulation accorded by Caliph Omar, 1, 295.
Jews, notice of this community in the Turkish empire, 2, 27, 28, 29, 30.
Job, Archbishop of Rostoff, raised to Primacy of Moscow and all Russia, 1582, from which annals of Russian Patriarchs date, 2, 58.
Jordan River, Mr. Stanley's notice of, 2, 10, 11.
Karmatians, Sale's account of their origin, and supposed founder, Karmata, 2, 164.
Kieff, ancient capital of Russia and cradle of Muscovite Christianity; cathedral erected in, by Prince Vladimir; its destruction by the Moguls in 1240, 2, 55, 57, 58.
Koran, the, its Christian apologists and eulogists, 1, 5; its true character; the organised fanaticism of Mohammedanism, 1, 6; its great doctrine; war against Christianity; death to the enemy who will not be converted and embrace the law of Islam; exposition of it by Ubicini, 1, 7; extracts from, illustrative of its tenets and teaching, 1, 58; English eulogists and admirers of; Sale, Lane, &c., extolled by Walpole, 1, 59, 64, 70; doubts of the authenticity of, as a genuine production of Mohammed and his scribes, 1, 68; passages from several chapters, 1, 76, 111; appealed to by the Mufti, Ali Bestami; after a solemn capitulation was entered into with the King of Bosnia by Sultan Mohammed the 2nd, and interpreted by that functionary for a justification of a violation of a capitulation, entered into with unbelievers, and putting to death the Christian king and his two sons, who had surrendered to the Sultan, 1, 300; similar decisions of the Mufti, justifying, on religious grounds, the projected massacre of the Christians, on the part of Sultan Selim the 1st, 1, 302; project for the extermination of the Christians, on religious grounds, discussed in the divan in the reign of Amurath the 4th in 1770 A.D., 1, 303; similar project agitated in the divan in the reign of Mustapha the 3rd 1, 303; similar project meditated by Sultan Mahmoud 2nd in 1821, A.D., and account of the insurrections in Greece and Moldavia, 1, 303; his orders for the executions of the patriarch of, Constantinople, and four Greek archbishops, 1, 304; Sultan Mahmoud's meditated extermination of the Christian Rayahs, on the news reaching Constantinople of the defeat of the Turks and destruction of their fleet at Navarino in 1828, 1, 304.
Kourscheed, Pacha, his infamous conduct in the affairs of Syria in 1861, 2, 288; lets loose the Bashi Bazouk soldiers on the Maronites, 2, 290, 292.

Lacordaire, views of Turkish Empire, 1, 21.
Latins, their condition in Turkey; jealousy of other Rayahs, Christian and Jewish on account of their prosperity, 2, 20, 21; their various religious estab ishments in the Levant 2, 221.
Latin Church, its separation from Greek Church 2, 63.
Lenormant, Mons., his account of the massacres he witnessed in Syria in 1860, 2, 285.
Lindsay, Lord, account of the Druses in "Letters on Egypt, Edom and the Holy Land," in 1836, 2, 224.
Louis, St., Letter to the Patriarch and Bishops of Maronites, in which he promises on the part of himself and successors on the throne of France, to afford them equal protection with French subjects, 2, 155.
Lyde, Rev. Samuel, his testimony as to the origin and religion of the Ansayrii, 2, 207.

MacFarlane, interview with the Druse Emir Bechir in 1847, 2, 222.
Machiavelli, his opinion of the Turkish empire 1, 13.
Mahmoud, Sultan of Ghazneh, his wars and conquests in Hindostan; career of, commenced in A.D. 997; his "loots" in India, 1, 212; his career of conquest and carnage in India; his spoiling of Hindostan; his "loot" in Lahore, and at Somnauth; the Christian "looters" in

China not to be compared with the Tartar "looters" in Hindostan; Mahmoud's demolition of the great idol in the temple of Sommauth; carries away the sandal wood gates of the temple; the same restored to the Hindoo pagans by Lord Ellenborough; his death "in the fulness of glory;" his magnificent tomb; his dynasty perfidiously assailed and destroyed by a Seljukian Turk, who had sought and obtained shelter in Sogdiana, 1, 230, 238; his death and manifestation of the ruling passion of his breast for war and rapine in the dying moments; end of a Tartar prince who was always prosperous, 1, 234.

Mahmoud II., Sultan, his career; attempted reforms; opposition at the hands of the Janissaries; his wars with Russia, Greece, the Wahabis, 1, 370, 379; author's recollection of his personal appearance; particulars of a Djereed tournament in Constantinople in 1824, 1, 424; his attempted reforms; the Janissary institution "reformed" altogether; massacre of the Janissaries in June, 1826, 1, 421, 428; loss of his fleet at Navarino in Oct., 1827; disastrous war with Russia, 1828-29; war with Egypt, 1839; observations on his career; his death 2nd July, 1839, 1, 430, 439; his tomb, 1, 440.

Maracci, his translation of, and commentaries on the Koran, 1, 39.

Maron, Saint, presumed patron of the Maronites, 2, 153.

Maronites, notice of, 2, 14; Ubicini's estimate of the population throughout Syria, 2, 161; uncertainty as to founder; protected by the French nation; early relation between them and the French; clergy, number of; convents, doctrines and numbers; hospitality, honesty, and industrious habits; number slain in late massacres, 8,000, 2, 153, 161; notice of their community in Syria, 2, 153, &c.; strenuous and persistent efforts in Press and Parliament to inculpate them and to vindicate the Druses 2, 353.

Massacres of Christians in Mosul, Blanqui's account of, 2, 278; in Bulgaria, Blanqui's account of, 2, 280; by the Druses of the Christians of Melen, 2, 291; at Damascus, by Druses, 2, 294, at Beteddin, 2, 300; at Deir-el-Kammar, 2, 301, 305; in Syria, in 1860, Mr. Graham's detailed report on, to Lord Dufferin, 2, 313, 326; authentic account of, by Mr. Wetzlern, 2, 327; in Damascus, detailed account, 2, 327, 332; further account of ditto, 2, 23, 33; protocol of conference, and articles of agreement of France, England, Austria, Prussia, and Rusia, in August, 1860, 2, 338; destruction of villages, estimate of, 2, 348; proceedings of Consuls in relation to, 2, 349; debates on, in parliament, 2, 355, 358, 359; Colonel Churchill's letter on, 2, 361; the law of Islam at the root of all the guilt, 2, 366; detailed account of their origin, progress, and full accomplishment in 1860, 2, 281, 368.

Massacres, Turkish, of Christian Rayahs; the Turkish panics, a usual occurrence, 1, 293, 297; Rayahs either executed or meditated, on religious grounds, at various epochs, 1, 293, 304.

Maundrell, his account of Turkish fanaticism in 1697, 2, 274.

Mechitar, an Armenian priest, efforts to reclaim his schismatic brethren; founded a religious order with the object of uniting the churches of the East to the Latin Church; death in 1749, 2, 137, 138, 140.

Metoualis, followers of; Aly, son-in-law of Mohammed; notice of, 2, 15; notice of, 2, 237; Dr. Thompson's account of, 2, 238; notice of the sect, 2, 241, 247.

Meteora, ruined monasteries of, perched on peaks of mountains and precipitous rocks, 2, 82.

Michon Abbé; observations relative to manners and customs of Armenian community, 2, 122, 124; expedition to the East in 1850, to reconcile the Greek and Latin Churches; his memorial to Pius IX, 2, 87, 90.

Missionaries (Roman Catholic and Protestant) rivalries and contentions of; Van de Velde's reference to their labours in 1851 and 1852; novel method of converting Christians and Jews of Syria to "true Christianity," by colporteurs, 2, 32, 33.

Mohammed, the pseudo prophet; notice of his career and religious principles, 1, 25; his raptures; visions in the cave of Hira; attacks of syncope; epileptic seizures, 1, 26; in his 40th year, commenced his mission of an apostle, 1, 27; utterly illiterate composition of the Koran; result of assistance of a Latin monk and of schismatic Jews and Christians, 1, 31; had no honour in his own country as an apostle for several years; in four years of his mission had only thirty-nine followers, 1, 33; in the 12th year of his mission, his miraculous night journey to heaven took place, 1, 33; orders his followers to pray with their faces towards Jerusalem; then ordered they should pray with their faces to Mecca and the Kebla, 1, 45; at the battle of Obud, wounded and worsted, 1, 46; from the year 623 A.D., continually engages in wars to extend his religion, 1, 46; by an alleged divine revelation, put his male prisoners to the sword, and made their wives and children captives, 1, 47; assumes the dignity of a prince and a pontiff, 1, 48; his alleged miracles, 1, 40; his wives, 1, 41; his flight from Mecca to Medina in 622 A.D; date of the Hegira, 1, 43; after his arrival in Modena, having acquired power at the expiration of thirteen years, changed the mode of propagating his religion from preaching to fighting, 1, 43; His first war; an attack on a caravan for the sake of plunder, in 622 A.D., 1, 44; his second attack on a caravan for sake of plunder, in 623, 1, 45; had poison administered to him at Chaibar, 1, 49; his belief in magic; said to have been bewitched by the Jews, 1, 50; in 629 A.D., captured Mecca; put to death many of the inhabitants; purged the Caaba of its idols, 1, 50; his death in Medina, 632 A.D., in his 62nd year, from the effects of the poison given to him by Chaibar; in his delirium, wished to dictate another book of revelations, but Omar would not suffer him, 1, 52; his followers quarrelled over his dead body; he had married no less than sixteen wives, 1, 53; his quarrel with his wives, 1, 55; his predominant passions, lust, and ambition, 1, 55; oral revelations of; traditions of the Sonna of heaven and hell, 1, 111, 115.

Mohammed 2nd, Sultan; capture of Constantinople; notice of his career, 1, 290; his violation of a capitulation entered into with the last king of the Bosnians; puts to death the king and his two sons, 1, 300.

Mohammed Ali, of Egypt, notice of his wars and conquests in Syria, and of his system of government there, 2, 43, 50; invasion of Syria in 1831, 2, 44, 45.
Mohammedanism; the realization of the principles of the Koran; a regime of blood and fanaticism, 1, 151; evil influence of on all government, civil and religious, 2, 407. Numbers of its followers throughout the world, 2, appendix.
Mokanna, the first to introduce into Islamism the doctrine of transmigration of souls, 2, 169.
Moldavia and Wallachia, union of and constitutional government declared by treaty of Paris, 1856, 2, 264, population of, 2, 265.
Monks and monasteries of the Greek Church, 2, 80, 84.
Montefiore, Sir Moses, originator of Relief Committee in aid of Syrian Christians, 2, 437.
Montenegro; administration of government; its own prince; population of, 2, 265.
Mouravieff, M., historian of the Russian Orthodox Greek Church, 2, 55.
Mustapha IV., Sultan; succeeds Selim III.; owed his elevation to the Janissaries; deposed and subsequently put to death by the orders of his successor, Mahmoud the 2nd, 1, 370, 372.

Napoleon, the Great, his views in regard to Turkey in 1807; his proposal to the Emperor Alexander to dismember Turkey, 1, 373.
Napoleon recognizes claims of Maronites to French protection, 2, 159.
Navarino, battle of; Panic at Constantinople; destruction of Turkish fleet; wild denunciation of the whole Christian community, 2, 143.
Nersus, Archbishop of Georgia, banished by Russian Government; called in 1843, by the Armenian Church to patriarchal see of Ecmiazin, 2, 135.
Nestorian church, doctrines of, 2, 53.
Newman, Dr., views of Turkish empire, 1, 21; opinion of the dire results of Turkish rule, 2, 406.
Nicholas, Emperor of Russia, his "pet project" of annexation of Turkey to his empire, 2, 257.

Omar Ebu Al Khattab, second Caliph; his war against the Persians in Irak; signal defeat of the Persians at Cadisea; fate of the Persian Empire sealed, A.D. 635; immense spoils taken by the Saracens; Omar's wars and victories in Syria; Jerusalem taken; terms of capitulation; all the principal towns and cities in Syria taken; invaded and subdued Egypt; orders the Alxandrian library to be burned; assassinated in 643, A.D., 1. 133, 147.
Ommiades, dynasty of; commencement with Caliph Moawiyah; death of this caliph; the first great schisms in Islamism began in the time of the Ommiades, the middle of the 7th century, with the contests for the union of temporal and sacerdotal office; the duration of the dynasty of the Ommiades was for about a century, till the middle of the 8th century: the innumerable sects that sprung up in this period productive of incessant strife, massacres and assassinations; in this state of things the secret order of the Assassins had its origin; notice of it, 1, 194, 204.
Orchan, 2nd Sultan of the Turks; first notice of the Turkish Sultans; fratricidal policy of, 1, 248, 269; the Janissary institution, origin of, 249; marries the daughter of the Greek Emperor Cantacuzene; establishes the Turkish capital at Brusa; foments civil war in Constantinople; invades the dominions of the Greek Emperor on the European side of the Bosphorus; takes possession of Gallipoli; plants several Turkish colonies in Thrace; his death in 1359 A.D.; lamentable state of Christendom at that period, 1, 248, 254.
Othman, the founder of the Turkish Empire, first sovereign of the Oguzian-sept of the Ottoman dominions; his immediate ancestors, 1, 239 245.
Othman, Third Caliph, extends former conquest in Persia, Syria, and Egypt; Persian government entirely destroyed 651 A.D.; Othman, assassinated 655 A.D., 1, 148, 154.
Ovaghian, execution of in 1843, by the Turkish Governorfor returning to his own Christian faith from Islamism.

Palestine, its physical geography, 2, 8, 9,; in ancient times; its population 2, 3; its ancient history, 2, 215.
Palmerston's, Lord, views of the regeneraton of Turkey, 1, 15.
Peter the Great, begins to meddle in spiritual affairs of his empire, 1700; displaces the patriarch, forms a Synod, 1721, 2, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63.
Pilgrims to Mecca; remarkable decrease of numbers; referred to by Burton, 1, 471.
Pitt's views of Turkish Empire, 1, 18.
Pius IX, failure of the steps taken by him at commencement of his pontificate to re-unite Greek and Latin Churches, 2, 90.
Princes Islands, monasteries of; one or two occupied by deposed patriarchs and disgraced friars, 1, 82.
Propaganda, founded in 1622 by Pope Gregory XV.; its proceedings in relation to the schismatic churches in the East; alleged violent acts of interference, 2, 136.
Proselytism, difference between Turkish and Christian systems of, 1, 293.
Protestants in Turkey; small success of Bible Society in making converts, 2, 37.
Persecution of the Armenians for frequenting Protestant churches. 2, 38, 39.
Protestantism, its unsuccessful missionary efforts in the Turkish Empire; Sale's sentiments on ditto; rivalries and contentions of Roman Catholic and Protestant missionaries, 2, 30, 36; prospects of Protestantism in Turkey, 2, 37, 42.
Protestant missions in Syria, effects of, 2, 209.

Rashideddin Abulhasher, his imposture; considered by oriental historians as the chief of the Ismailitic doctrine in Syria, 2, 183, 184.
Reasons of state; pleas for perfidy, and pretexts for acts of infamy and injustice; observations on, 1, 375.
Religion by law established; the interests of more power powerful than those of the state, 1, 71.
Reschid Pachas; panacea for evils of Turkish rule, 1, 16.
Rhigas of Thessaly, the Greek poet, patriot, and martyr; notice of his career, 2, 258, 262.
Robertson the historian, his opinion of evil results of Turkish rule, 2, 406.

Rockneddin, the last Grand Master of the Order of the Assassins, 2, 186.
Bousseau Pere, his account of the principal Syrian massacres, 2, 307.
Russian policy in regard to Turkey from the time of Peter the Great and the Empress Catherine, 1, 353, 356; ditto in the time of the Emperor Alexander in 1804, 1805, and 1807, 1, 362, 368; war with Turkey from 1808 to 1812, 1, 358, 363, 376; treaty of peace with Turkey entered into at Adrianople in 1829, 1, 423; the recent war, with its causes and results; Sir H. Seymour's correspondence; conversations with the Czar, Nicholas, about "the sick man," I, 474, 483; views of the Emperor Nicholas; official correspondence respecting Turkey in the spring of 1853; controversies respecting the custody of the Holy Place, from 1830 to the 11th November, 1853; declared war against Turkey, 1, 481, 502; alliance of France and England, and declaration of war against Russia, 1, 513; expenditure of men and money in the Crimean war, 1, 8, 513; notice of the Orthodox Greek, 2, 55; influence of, over the great mass of the Christian population of Turkish Empire; exercise and results of, at various periods, 2, 248, 258; its views as to dismemberment of Turkish Empire, 2, 411.

Sandy's opinion of its iniquitous government, 1, 14,
Sandy's, Maundrell's &c., travellers in Turkey, the best authorities, 1, 2.
Sale, his views relative to the conversion of the Moslems by Protestants, 2, 30.
Saracens, origin, religion, conversion from Sabianism to Mohammedanism; leading characteristics distinguished from Turks intellectually and morally, 1, 116 127; their astonishing progress from epoch of Hegira (A.D. 632) to death of Omar in 643 A.D., 1, 141, 147; everywhere perfidiously turned on by the Turkish hordes; received into the different provinces were they were generously allowed to settle or were employed as auxiliary forces; their rebellion against their benefactors in Sogdiana, Bagdad, and Damascus; their murders of Caliphs, &c., 1, 210, 212.
Schauffler, Rev. W. G., estimate of number of Greeks in Turkish empire, 2, 66.
Schiites, heterodox sect of Islamism, 1, 196.
Seljuk, a Turcoman chief, grandfather of To-
Servia Bey, notice of, 1, 236.
grul placed under government of its own prince elected in 1850; its population, 2, 265.
Servitude long continued; its debasing and degrading influences exemplified in the usual vices of all enslaved people in the case of the Greeks, 2, 257.
Seveners or Ismailites, the most predominant of the Mohammedan sects; origin of their power 2, 171.
Sheik Bechir, a Druse chief; in 1827 when the author visited Syria his jurisdiction extended over all Mount Lebanon; deprived of his government and banished in 1846, 2, 217, 219; his statement in 1847 to Macfarlane of his betrayal by the British and consequent ruin, 2, 223.
Selim III., Sultan, his career; attempted reform; opposition at the hands of the Janissaries; conspiracy against Selim; his deposition and subsequent murder by order of his successor Mustapha, 1, 353, 369.
Sextus V., efforts to effect a reconciliation with the schismatic churches of the east, 1587, 2, 137.
Sinope, battle of in Nov. 1853, 1, 502.
Skene, Consul, opinion of dire results of Turkish rule, 2, 403.
Slaves, Christian; Turkish slave market for sale of Christian slaves in Constantinople in virtue of an infamous treaty of Orchan, Turkish sovereign, with the Greek Emperor; Sultan Amurath's claim to fifth part of all spoil taken in wars with Christians, 1, 261.
Sonnites, orthodox sect of Islamism account of, 1, 195.
Solyman, the Seljuikan Tartar Turcoman chief driven from his country seeks a refuge in Roumania; takes up his abode in Amasia; makes continual wars on the Christians of that region; had to fly to Syria, purposing to return with his tribe to Tartary, and trying to cross the Euphrates, perished in that river; 1, 240, 241.
Solyman Schah, the Turkoman chief who perished in the Euphrates, left four sons, one of whom Ertogrul was the father of Othman, the founder of the Ottoman empire, 1, 242, 245.
Smyrna to Constantinople, journey of the author in 1824, through an uucultivated country, of 300 miles extent, 1, 19.
Stanley, Rev. A. N., his observations relative to physical geography of Syria, 2, 8.
Synod of Russian Church, instituted by Peter the Great; its original composition; Mouravieff's observations relative to its dependence on the Czar, 2, 61, 63.
Syria, its divisions, sects, and races, 2, 1, 2, 3, 4; language of different races.
Syrian massacres of 1860, an extensive notice of from beginning to end, 2, 267.
Syrian Christians, various plans for government of the Lebanon, 2, 382.

Tartar Race; origin of the Turcoman tribes; the Seljukian Turks; the founders of the Ottoman Empire; notice of ancient Tartary; the Scythian hordes; the three highways of their migrations; southward and westward into Europe across the Danube; the Oxus and the Caucasus, 1, 205, 238; wars and conquests of Attila, Zinghis, Khan, and Timour; the hordes of Huns, Goths, Scythians, constituting the Tartar power; the old store-house of nations; its fearful provision of havoc and devastation impending on all ancient civilization, 1, 217, 229.
Theodore, Czar, causes creation of a distinct and independent patriarchate of Greek Church in Russia, 1587, 2, 59.
Thompson, Dr, estimate of numbers of different Syrian races and sects, 2, 16, 17.
Thornton, Mr., opinion of evil results of Turkish rule, 2, 406.
Timour, his wars, conquests, and massacres; at Delhi; his slaughter of 100,000 prisoners; his impost on Ispahan of 70,000 human heads to build towers with; similar tax levied at Bagdad of 90,000 skulls; Timour, like Zinghis, Khan, and Attila, "died in the fullness of glory," prosperous in all their great murderous undertakings; his achievements against the Ottomans, 1, 227, 244; his career of war and conquest in the Turkish Empire; his defeat and capture of the Sultan Bajazet; con-

finement of his captive in an iron cage, 1, 278; brief notice of his conquests in various regions of the globe; his lust of dominion; passion for annexing kingdoms; his massacres; his death; observations on his character and career, 1, 278, 288.

Togrul Beg, a Turcoman chief, his wars and conquests in the Greek provinces in Asia Minor, 1, 236.

Turkish Empire; our last war for its maintenance; cost of life and treasure from official returns, 1, 8,513; its Christian eulogists, 1, 17; Pitt's views of the necessity of sustaining it, 1, 18; true interest of England in relation to, 1, 19; Turks distinguished from Saracens, intellectually and morally, 1, 119, 120, the Turcoman tribes of; notices of, 1, 209, 219; perfidy of its people, a characteristic of theirs at all periods of their history; against the Saracens, the Persians, the Caliphs of Bagdad, Damascus; the Dynasty of Soldan; Mahmoud in Sogdiana, 1, 235, 236; barbarous fratricidal policy of Turkish sovereigns, 1, 248, 269, 298; the leading and distinguishing characteristics of the nation and the individual; abhorrence of Christianity, and an insatiatible thirst for the blood of Christians, 1, 256; sympathy of the old English historical writers, such as Knolles, with down-trodden Christianity, and the sufferings of Christians at the hands of the Turks, to be sought for in vain in the pages of our modern historical writers, 1, 258; its institutions connected with the religion and the law of Islam; notice of origin and attributes of the several offices of the Sheik-ul-Islam, the Mufti, the Ulemas, the Imaums, Kayims, the Muezzims, legal officers, the Mollahs, the Cadis, the Nahibs, the Katibs, 1, 306, 318; proposal of government to British ambassador to obtain a loan and mortgage the revenues of the mosques, as security for re-payment of loan, 1, 375; newspaper press in the Ottoman Empire, notice of, 1, 435; the reform doctrine of Sultan Mahmoud the 2nd, supposed to have shaken the faith of vast numbers of his people, and to have led to infidelity more formidable even than fanaticism, 1, 437; the projected reforms, practical failures, 1, 438; the connexion of the state with the church, and the impediments of that connexion to all efforts at reform, involving toleration and religious liberty, 1, 459; fanaticism inculcated in all its schools and mosques, 1, 460; its hierarchs; the Sheik-ul-Islam, Mufti, and Ulemas, opposed to all reforms, 1, 463; vain efforts to reform its institutions and lamentable effects of Turkish rule; depopulation and abandonment of cultivation in the finest regions of the globe, 1, 465, 473; author's experience of the fact in a land journey from Smyrna to Constantinople, 1, 465; inevitable downfall of, 1, 472; fanaticism of its people in 1853; the Sultan compelled by it to declare war against Russia, 1, 498, 502, 504, 507; expenditure incurred by England for its maintenance in the Crimean war; total loss of life sustained by the English in that war, 1, 8, 512, 513, 514; statistics of population, races, creeds, finances, resources, expenditure, loans, 1, 515, 543; observations on financial embarrassments of, and inevitable ruin of them, which must lead to dissolution of Turkish Empire, 1, 543, 546; finances of, the state of, in the last year of the reign of Sultan Abdul Medjid; enormous expenditure on palaces, harems; prevalent corruption in every department of the state; ruinous expedient to obtain ready money, mortgaging of revenues indispensable for ordinary expenditure of government, to pay interest on foreign loans; dissolution of the Turkish Empire an impossibility to avert, 1, 532, 544; civilization, no evidences of, in the uncultivated soil of European Turkey, Asia Minor, Syria, &c., 1, 20, 21, 23, 466; policy of, in the East, the setting of one Rayah faction against another; dividing and governing embroiled Christian sects, and arraying one race against another, imitated in some Christian countries, 2, 274; its rule in the East; barbarities of, described by Walpole, 2, 275; the normal state of, one of insolvency, and permanent inability to defray expenditure of government, 2, 520; its revenue, expenditure, and public debt, in 1861, 2, 555; rule, dire results of, 2, 403; maintenance of, and perpetuation of, the dire results of its results, ascribed, by a recent writer, to Great Britain, 2, 410; ruinous results of its rule in the East, described by Count Gurowski, 2, 411; impending doom of: opinion of, Dr. Newman, 2, 415.

Tyre and Sidon, notice of; author's recollection of, 2, 467.

Ubicini, M., errors in his "Letters sur la Turquie," relative to Roman Catholic population of Turkish Empire, 2, 17, 18.

Wahabis, the Turkish and Egyptian war against notice of, 1, 379.

Walpole, Hon. F., his account of Turkish fanaticism, 2, 275; his account of the Ansayrii in "Travels in the East," 2, 197.

Warriors, Great, the Tartarean region assigned for their manes in another world; happy meeting of the ghosts of Sesostrias, Cyrus, Cambyses, Alexander, Cæsar, Attilla, Kinghez Khan, Timour, Mahmoud of Gazneh, Cromwell and Bonaparte on the shores of Tartarus, 1, 235; Views of Poggius, the Florentine, of their titles to glory and of their heroism bordering on the domain of insanity, 4, 288.

Wilberforce, Mr., observations relative to movement of the Bulgarians for a re-union with Church of Rome, and wish of certain Turkish provinces to inoculate their nationalities with the French spirit; historical traditions relative to cause of this movement, 2, 22, 23, 24, 25.

Velde, Van de, his account of Protestant missionary labours in Syria, 2, 33, 34, 35.

Vladmir, Prince, the first Russian prince who joined the orthodox Greek Church; circumstance which led to this event, and origin of Christianity in Russia, 2, 57.

Vogue, De Comte, his account of the Syrian massacres in 1860, 2, 287.

T. C. NEWBY, 30, WELBECK STREET, CAVENDISH SQUARE.

DR439 .M17 v.2
The Turkish empire.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00022 5146